DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 921 IR 007 208

AUTHOR O'Connor, John E., Ed.
TITLE Film and the Humanities.
INSTITUTION Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 77
NOTE 38p.; Working papers of a conference convened by the Rockefeller Foundation's Humanities Program (New York, New York, October 19, 1976); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS American Culture; Anthropology; Documentaries; Film Criticism; Film Production; *Films; *Film Study; History; *Humanities; Literature; *Models; Philosophy; *Program Descriptions

ABSTRACT

This report on a conference, which brought together representatives of various humanistic disciplines to explore the cross-disciplinary appeal of film study as well as the use of film in stimulating scholarship and teaching, includes a narrative summary of the day's conversations and issues raised, as well as of reprints of articles that suggest different theoretical models that have been applied to film and film use in the humanities. In the first of these, William Arrowsmith presents a rationale for the study of film within the context of a traditional humanities orientation. John E. O'Connor relates film study to the study of history, James C. Curtis and J. Joseph Huthmacher discuss American studies and film, Dean Wilson Hartley presents a primer on literature through film, Jerry H. Gill explores philosophy and film, and Jay Ruby relates the use of film in anthropology. Lists of books and articles relating film study to the humanities are also provided, as well as a guide to organizations and periodicals in this area and general reference aids for locating and evaluating films. (RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169921

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILM AND THE HUMANITIES

Edited by

John E. O'Connor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Henry Romney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The Rockefeller Foundation

August 1977

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Film and the humanities.

(Working papers - The Rockefeller Foundation)
Based on papers from a conference convened by the Rockefeller Foundation's Humanities program and held in New York City, Oct. 19, 1976.
Bibliography: p.
1. Moving-pictures--Congresses. 2. Moving-pictures in education--Congresses. I. O'Connor, John E. II. Series: Rockefeller Foundation. Working papers - The Rockefeller Foundation.
LB1044.F426 371.33'523 77-11044

Published in August 1977 by The Rockefeller Foundation

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

	Page
Participants	v
Preface	vii
Narrative Summary	1
Basic Issues	13
Selected Reprints	17
"Film as Educator" - William Arrowsmith	18
"Film Study and the History Classroom" - John E. O'Connor	28
"The American Dream on Film" - James C. Curtis and J. Joseph Huthmacher	35
"How Do We Teach It?: A Primer for the Basic Literature/Film Course" - Dean Wilson Hartley	39
"Philosophy and Film" - Jerry H. Gill	45
"Anthropology and Film" - Jay Ruby	56
Bibliographic Guide	63
A. Journals and Organizations	64
B. Select Bibliography	67
C. Access to Films	77

PARTICIPANTS

Leo Braudy
Department of English and Comparative Literature
Columbia University
New York, New York

Terrell Ward Bynum
The National Information and Resource Center for the Teaching of Philosophy
Hyde Park, New York

Stanley L. Cavell
Department of Philosophy
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Thomas R. Cripps
Department of History
Morgan State College
Baltimore, Maryland

Ann Douglas
Department of English
Columbia University
New York, New York

Thomas L. Erskine
Literature/Film Quarterly
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, Maryland

Ronald Gottesman
Director, Center for the Humanities
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Sam L. Grogg, Jr.
Education Liaison
American Film Institute
Washington, D.C.

Sandra S. Herbert
Department of History
University of Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland

Barbara J. Humphrys
Motion Picture Section
The Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Martin A. Jackson
Historians Film Committee and
SUNY Maritime College
Fort Schuyler, New York

Daniel J. Leab
Department of History
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey
and
School of the Arts
Columbia University
New York, New York

Matthew Lipman
Director, Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children
Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Annette Michelson
Department of Cinema Studies
New York University
New York, New York

Mary Milton
Program Director, The Inter-University Center for Film Studies in Paris, France
Council on International Education
New York, New York

Sydney H. Nathans
Department of History
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

John E. O'Connor
Department of Humanities
New Jersey Institute of Technology
Newark, New Jersey

Darcy Paletz
University of North Carolina Television Network
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Anthony N. Penna
Department of History
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Steve Rabin
Division of Public Programs
National Endowment for the Humanities
Washington, D.C.

Joseph W. Reed, Jr.
Department of English
Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut

Susan Rice
Media and Methods
North American Publishing Co.
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Peter Rollins
Department of English
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

Jay Ruby
Department of Anthropology
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Stuart R. Samuels
Department of History
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Win Sharples, Jr.
Preservation and Documentation Administrator
American Film Institute
Washington, D.C.

Robert A. Sklar
Professor of American Studies
Bard College
Annandale-on-Hudson, New York

Arthur L. Smith
Director, Audiovisual Department
The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation
Williamsburg, Virginia

Robert Snyder
The Center for Learning Resources
International College
Los Angeles, California

Donald E. Staples
Department of Cinema Studies
New York University
New York, New York

Paul J. Vanderwood
Department of History
San Diego State University
La Jolla, California

Mathias von Brauschitsch
Metropolitan Pittsburgh Public Broadcasting
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Howard Sayre Weaver
Yale University Media Design Studio
New Haven, Connecticut

James M. Welsh
Literature/Film Quarterly
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, Maryland

Seth Willenson
Films, Incorporated
New York, New York

Peter Wood
Department of History
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

From The Rockefeller Foundation:

Joel Colton
Director for Humanities

D. Lydia Bronte
Associate Director for Humanities

Jane Allen
Conference Officer

PREFACE

On October 19, 1976, the Rockefeller Foundation's Humanities program convened a conference in New York on "Film and the Humanities." The intent was to bring together representatives of various humanistic disciplines who shared with each other an interest in film so that they might explore the cross-disciplinary appeal of film study as well as the use of film in stimulating scholarship and teaching in a variety of areas. Not only did the conference consider such practical problems as the availability, utilization, and production of high quality film for teaching and scholarship in the humanities, it also went far to assess the impact of this important contemporary art form and to establish that "film studies" is emerging as a humanistic discipline in its own right, with rich resources for deepening our understanding of the human condition and human creativity.

* * *

The report on the conference is published here in Part I, in two sections. The first section consists of a list of participants and a narrative summary of the day's conversations, which, as they should in all good conferences, ranged from the friendly to the mildly acrimonious. In the second section, an attempt has been made to isolate and define some of the basic issues raised in an effort to encourage further debate and clarification.

Parts II and III seek to answer needs that emerged from the discussions at the conference and that were widely recognized by the conference participants. Part II consists of reprints of a number of articles that suggest different theoretical models that have been applied to film and film use by scholars in fields such as classics, history, literature, philosophy, and anthropology. The purpose here is to encourage a keener awareness of the directions being taken by colleagues in various humanistic disciplines. To the authors of the articles and to their original publishers, who kindly consented to this reprinting, we are grateful.

Part III contains a bibliography of books and articles relating film study to various humanistic disciplines. The items were selected in order

to encourage further inquiry into the ways in which humanistic scholars have been coming to grips with the visual media in their scholarship and teaching. It also provides a guide to organizations and periodicals concerned with film and the humanities, and general reference aids for locating and evaluating available films. It is hoped that these bibliographical materials, which to our knowledge have never before been gathered together in this way, will prove of value not only for those readers new to the study of film but for the versed and experienced as well.

* * *

This publication would not have been possible without the careful, conscientious, and thoughtful work of John E. O'Connor, of the Department of Humanities, New Jersey Institute of Technology, and an active participant in the conference. He skillfully transformed the typescript of the taped proceedings into a readable summary, selected the articles to be reprinted, and prepared the bibliographical materials. For their generosity in responding to inquiries and for suggesting additional bibliographical materials we are grateful to Ronald Gottesman, Director, Center for the Humanities, University of Southern California; Sam L. Grogg, Jr., of the American Film Institute; Barbara J. Humphrys, of the Motion Picture Section, the Library of Congress; Peter Rollins, of the Department of English, Oklahoma State University; and James M. Welsh, editor of Literature/Film Quarterly.

August 1977

Joel Colton
Director for Humanities

NARRATIVE SUMMARY

The tone for the meeting was set by Dr. Colton who welcomed the participants and focused their attention on the constructive potentials of modern media for the humanities. Marshall McLuhan's alarming predictions about the end of the print era appear to have been premature, Colton surmised: "Gutenberg's invention is here to stay." But the extraordinary popularity of film is evident everywhere. Parents who used to report that their sons or daughters who had dropped out of school for a year were "writing a novel," are now more likely to say they are "making a film." We would be remiss "as scholars, as teachers, [and] as thoughtful people," if we did not seek to understand the modes of communication that our own technological age has produced, and consider how to use them to transmit "the best that has been thought and said and done in human affairs."

First to address the conference were representatives of several journals and professional associations. They emphasized that many groups in the humanities have become alert to the potentials and problems of film use: an editor of Film & History spoke for historians, the American Studies Association was represented by the chairman of its new film committee, the editors of Literature/Film Quarterly spoke for English teachers, and representatives from the American Film Institute (A.F.I.) surveyed the general field of film studies.

James Welsh explained that literature professors are more and more concerned with film itself, and no longer feel restricted to films that reflect other literary forms:

> There is a need, I submit, for English courses in Literature and Film, or Drama and Film, or Shakespeare and Film, and many such courses have been designed and are in operation. But it also makes sense to us to study the humanistic substance of films that may not derive from literary sources, and we have tried to pay attention to that particular kind of study in Literature/Film Quarterly.
>
> We do not believe film should be used merely to illustrate classics of literature. A humanities course that takes as its substance the cinema of Ingmar Bergman, to take one unassailable example, makes as much sense to us as one concentrating upon the plays of Shakespeare or Eugene O'Neill.

No One Way

The many different approaches to film study were also noted by Sam Grogg, who reported the results of a recent A.F.I. poll:

> One of the things we found out that I think would interest you was, indeed, confirmation of the fact that film is taught all across the spectrum of the disciplines and in over ninety different academic departments. It seems there is no one way to approach film study - nor should there be, I think. We found that there is no agreement, say, on a core collection of film. We asked what three films were most often used in classroom teaching; we were confronted with 482 different titles. So, it's tough to observe that universe. When we asked what three books were most often used, there were over 150 different titles - the three most often used textbooks, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

The survey also suggested that while many film teachers have no formal training or academic degrees in cinema studies, most have had some professional experience with film and desire further academic preparation in the field. Specific plans exist within several organizations to help guide teachers who may be new to film. Peter Rollins noted the activities of the American Studies Association film committee in publishing a newsletter and framing a model course in American Studies through film. Win Sharples discussed the A.F.I.'s plans for an introductory course on the American film to be aired over public television, with supplementary materials such as film extracts being made available to film teachers everywhere.

Peer Approval

James Welsh, Terrell Bynum, and John O'Connor described a common obstacle faced by advocates of film in traditional humanities areas: colleagues in literature, philosophy or history departments view film studies with suspicion. Those who use film are seen as less-than-serious scholars, and are thought by some to be demeaning the "genuine" humanistic issues with which intellectuals should be concerned. This disdain often translates into negative sanctions when tenure and promotion decisions are made. Part of the problem may be the absence of "visual literacy" among many humanists; it is very hard to break ground against an overwhelming bias in favor of the book. Terrell Bynum identified the keys to encouraging

and improving the use of film in teaching philosophy:

> First of all, there must be a gain in respectability, some reward and some respect for doing this, and not static from one's colleagues that what you are doing is "entertaining the kids and not doing your job as a lecturer and interpreter"; and, second, access to films themselves, and descriptions and critical materials that will help teachers learn how to use film effectively in the teaching of philosophy.

Little progress can be expected in integrating film into the humanities until the national professional bodies voice their approval of the experiments of young scholars. James Welsh listed some recent examples to suggest that, in literature at least, the professional organizations and major journals have begun to be responsive. But without the support of the various guilds, the spirit of the cause will surely die.

Multiple Choices

Access to films and information about them was another focus of the morning session. Seth Willenson and Darcy Paletz spoke of the availability of films for classroom viewing. Willenson saw part of the problem as the underutilization of materials already available. Noting the frequent use of films such as Citizen Kane, he pointed out that the master list of the Films Incorporated collection includes 3,500 titles, many of which are seldom, if ever, shown to students. Darcy Paletz stressed the need for selective lists of films on various themes so that teachers might make more sensible choices, and suggested that regional conferences be held so that distributors could make their catalogs available and screen films for teachers to preview. Another suggestion for making a body of film easily available for classroom study was offered by Robert Snyder. He proposed that a representative selection of classic silent films, such as those referred to in Raymond Spottiswoode's Film and Its Technique, be given to every state public library in the nation. The entire cost might be as little as $150,000. Snyder also remarked upon the concentration of interest on entertainment and suggested that more attention be paid to non-fiction and documentary film. Nonetheless, access to film and the means of financing film leases and rentals remain perplexing problems for many humanists.

Research Skills

Barbara Humphrys' perspective was slightly different. As a librarian in the Motion Picture Division of the Library of Congress, she was particularly aware of the unavailability of print sources about film, many of which have become collectors' items, too rare for convenient scholarly reference. She noted the failure of traditional degree programs in the humanities to teach basic research skills as they applied to cinematic materials, but also pointed out that students of cinema are often at a loss as to how to approach printed matter. There is clearly a need to articulate some basic procedures for scholarly research in film, and yet there are inherent difficulties. As Joseph Reed later remarked, film scholars are unique - they are "the only scholars who have to rent their materials in order to write about them."

Room of One's Own

Toward the end of the morning session a new issue was raised. Until this point, attention had been directed almost solely to the use of film in the teaching of the humanities. Now several people spoke up to defend cinema study as a humanistic discipline in its own right: films are worthy of study for what they can teach us as films. As Leo Braudy explained:

> Almost everything that has been said about the use of film in the university has been about the instrumental use of film, the illustrative use. Very little has been said about film's intrinsic use and the development of theoretical courses of film curriculum - that is, the study of film involved in film itself. It seems to be part of the history of the development of a discipline which always begins with the philological: the gathering of materials, moving on to the illustrative and instrumental, and, finally, getting into the works themselves and finding out what they can teach - not as illustrations of some other existing discipline, not to be brought in under the honorific umbrella of another academic department or a grant, but to gain respect by concentrating on the medium itself, and how it is constructed - I mean, all of its inner nature.

Ronald Gottesman concurred, stressing that films are important because "they tell us something about the human capacity to create." Gottesman defended film as an artistic medium, and argued that concern should be given

not only to "film and the humanities" but to

> film as a humanity, film as a way of our seeing: coming to understand ourselves as human beings and the full range of the waves of the meanings that are entailed in becoming fully human.
>
> One of the things that film has made possible is a richer set of possibilities for being human, through the projection of self on a screen. These are things that I hope we will get into.

Taking an institutional perspective, Donald Staples pointed out that 1970 marked a turning point in the struggle for respectability: in that year the New York State Board of Regents authorized the New York University graduate program in Cinema Studies to grant a Ph.D. degree. Another milestone was the Regents' decision to allow high school students to prepare essays about either a book or a film for their statewide examinations. Now the problem seems to be more what Joseph Reed called "local respectability," as film advocates in more traditional humanistic disciplines seek the approval of their colleagues.

Staples went on to suggest that cinema specialists might now be able to assist others in the struggle to win respect for their scholarly work with motion pictures. It has been established in film departments, he explained, "that articles about film, films about film, and film productions are all legitimate publications; they get copyrighted; they get just as much credit for tenure and promotion as anything else," and statements to that effect have been made by the University Film Association and by the American Council on the Arts and Education. The closing note of the morning session was clear: film is a part of the humanities. But earlier discussion made it obvious that this information had not yet reached many in the more traditional humanistic fields of study.

Boundless Freedom

The afternoon session focused on more general questions about film studies and the humanities. Annette Michelson, Ann Douglas, and Sam Grogg spoke of the feeling of freedom and innovation that came from pioneering in a new humanistic discipline and seeking connections with other more established areas, such as psychology, philosophy, and literary criticism. As

yet no fixed scholarly approach to film has been delineated to destroy this sense of discovery. Michelson commented that she was excited "by the prospect of helping to institute an object of study or of knowledge, and that means...inventing a great many fictions which go by the name of 'film history' and 'film theory' and so on." She went on to stress that "it is still not only an experimental but a speculative enterprise."

Ann Douglas expressed her enthusiasm at teaching film:

> I feel that film is, in a sense, an escape from other academic disciplines - eventually, a model for them even as it is drawing on them. I have this sense of liberation in teaching film, for myself as well as for my students. We all have a sense of excitement that everything within the university is correlated with whole areas of private and public, vicarious and direct experiences but which we have never before been allowed to explore in a classroom.

Arcane and Hermetic Language

However, questions were raised about some of the conventions with which many film scholars seem most comfortable. In particular, Robert Sklar asked whether the advocates of cinema as an independent area of study were not developing a vocabulary so technical and specific that newcomers to film, be they undergraduates or specialists in other fields, might not be able to comprehend it:

> A great deal of the work being done to develop a more precise, more carefully defined mode of analysis of film does borrow, perhaps paradoxically, perhaps naturally, from traditional humanities fields such as anthropology, philosophy, linguistics, structuralism, semiotics, and so on. So film study, obviously, is not developing in itself but rather in a conjectural relationship with other humanistic disciplines. Nevertheless, I think there is a potential problem emerging - that of film specialization as removed from a common discourse within the humanities. I find a growing use of hermetic language being used in film studies, perhaps of necessity, in order to achieve the precision that is desired, but nevertheless, a kind of language that necessarily separates film studies from disciplines which commonly use a plain style in their discourse. This vocabulary makes film studies confounding for the introductory student with a beginning interest in film.

Sklar went on to say that if the tendency to erect barriers rather than bridges to understanding persisted, then ten years from now cinema

studies and the other humanities might be farther apart rather than closer together. Susan Rice echoed Sklar, and pointed out that a reliance on such formal and technical terminology might have other negative results. She explained that the spirit of innovation and discovery in film studies could not coexist very long with this "arcane, secret, hermetic language."

The Formative Years

Another concern was the state of film education in primary and secondary schools. Although few seemed to agree with the statement that by the time a student reached college it was too late to teach him or her about film, several speakers felt that it was crucial to introduce young children to visual experiences. Matthew Lipman stressed the need to somehow acquaint children with the humanistic values of our civilization and get them to think in those terms. He went on to explain:

> There has been very little said here about the use of film for elementary and secondary education, and yet the problem of acquainting children with the humanities and getting them to think in terms of the humanities is, it seems to me, more important than dealing with the problem of the adult, because by the time one reaches the adult world, and I include here the world of college students, it is too late. Adults are finished; their thought patterns are largely set. And I think that unless you can get to the children all you are going to do is repeat the mistakes of the past. The world is moving toward a century which will exceed in horror even the one we live in, unless we can somehow enlighten children with the humanistic values of our civilization and get them to think in those terms.
>
> Now, I make two points there. It's not enough to acquaint children with history - you must get them to think historically. It's not enough to acquaint them with philosophy, one must get them to think philosophically; it's not enough to present them with films, they must be taught to think filmically.

As Anthony Penna further explained, it is most productive to reach children early, when they are "still in the process of formulating a set of ideas and a set of strategies for coping with information for the rest of their lives."

More controversial was the question of how to go about using film in the classroom. Several comments were made about the pedagogical weaknesses and inadequacies of many primary and secondary school teachers. As Lipman

put it: "Many teachers in elementary schools use film to paralyze their students and numb them, just as television is used to entertain them, which is another way of numbing them," rather than provoking them to think.

Only Connect

Susan Rice expressed a concern that adults might by trying too hard to direct children's learning, even to the point of expecting a particular response to a film:

> I edited a book entitled Films Kids Like, which I thought was a rather modest endeavor; instantly I became an expert, because nobody else had been doing this sort of thing. We showed short films - which seemed to be most appropriate for short people, so to speak - to thousands of kids, and then put out a catalog based on their response to the films. Often educators go about it by determining themselves what they think is appropriate for children; then they present it to the children and punish them for not responding to their adult determinations.
>
> Children watch movies differently from the way we do. They crawl up on their bellies, very close to the screen; they talk throughout the movie. Adults tend to be reverent and silent and distant; everybody wants to sit in the back row. Maybe it's a function of age and farsightedness, I am not sure. But children have changed, I think, in the way they perceive film. And when I say we don't know how to measure the way in which they are learning, I don't mean you have to attach electrodes to the child's brain, or measure reading capacities before and after "reading" movies. There are a lot of things you can observe by just walking among children, being with them as they watch film.
>
> The important thing, in my view, is to encourage children to take an active attitude toward film when they finish seeing it so they won't take on that silent, unanalytic, uncritical attitude after an experience with a moving image.

But should the teacher stand back, as Rice proposed, and allow the students to relate freely to the visual experience - not indicating that any one response to a particular film is "the proper one"; or must the teacher, as Thomas Cripps argued, maintain the role of the "authority," the one who possesses knowledge and dispenses it to his students? Sydney Nathans' experience at Duke University seemed to bear out the latter view:

> What I discovered was that, without a good deal of guidance, response to films was quite a passive, isn't-that-an-interesting-film sort of thing. It became necessary for me to provide a context for them, particularly in dealing with older historical films.

> I can recall going to see Rebel Without a Cause and hearing the student audience just laugh and laugh at the actors' dress and behavior, and at what people of that time thought was serious and romantic. You have to establish why it was that people took these films seriously, why they worried about the invasion of the body-snatchers, why they took James Dean seriously.

In relating techniques of film education to classroom methods in other areas, Stuart Samuels suggested that the question was whether or not film was used to help students "demystify the world" or to "continue their mystification." Finally, after several reminders about the different situations of teachers in primary and secondary schools, and professors in the universities, it was agreed that allowing children to see the ambiguity in a visual experience might be a form of demystification, and that a teacher might be an "authority" in a field without having to take an "authoritarian" approach in the classroom.

Educating Educational Films

Yet another way in which the emerging field of film study comes into contact with the older and more traditional humanistic disciplines is in the production of films about history, philosophy, art, dance, etc. Several professional filmmakers were present, as were a few academic humanists who had also become involved in film production, and they offered observations. Robert Snyder suggested that Americans might learn from the considerable experience of the Open University in England, which has produced its own films and integrated them into educational programs. Mathias Von Brauschitsch discussed some of his experiences in making "educational films," especially the Decades of Decision series produced for the National Geographic Society. Von Brauschitsch was particularly concerned about the problem of maintaining production values while creating a film which would provoke students to think.

Sandra Herbert, who uses film to help teach the history of science, and Martin Jackson, who described the responses of adult participants in film programs run by the National Project Center for Film and the Humanities, both agreed that most films that have been made for the classroom were poor filmically and ineffective as teaching tools. The opinion was also

expressed that the production of such "educational films" simply might not be worth the effort that goes into them.

But there were others present who saw things differently. Howard Weaver, director of the Media Design Studio at Yale, explained the Studio's efforts to produce films that both teach and entertain by bringing a film-maker and humanist together in a joint enterprise. He described the first in a series of films on the American West now in production at the Studio in association with a Yale history professor, Howard Lamar, and pointed out the unique relationship established there between scholar and film-maker: "If the choice comes down to one of the film-maker versus the scholar, the scholar will win." But some, such as Peter Wood, consider collaboration to be an unsatisfactory compromise. As Wood put it:

> There are humanists who have messed around in film, and film-makers have messed around in history, but it really hasn't gone beyond "messing around" in more than half a dozen cases yet, and I don't think we are really going to move into a new phase until we have gone beyond the collaborative idea.

A few teaching films have been made by humanists who have themselves taken on the role of film-maker. One who was present, Peter Rollins, mentioned his own work in the production of a film about Will Rogers and also described the several films made by Patrick Griffin, an historian film-maker.

One of the final comments came from Jay Ruby. He explained that there is:

> ...a tradition in anthropology that has made anthropologists articulate with film since film's existence; it has always been small but it has always been there, and although often we are doing it ineptly, still we are trying to do things like make, use, and analyze films. It is a strong tradition, so I think that some of the problems that others have don't exist in anthropology. It's part of the identification badge of an anthropologist to take pictures, whether stills or movies.

Ruby described some of his work at Temple University, where he is trying to work out a common linguistic code for anthropology and film-making, and he warned that too often film-makers mistakenly feel that they can study history or anthropology for six weeks and learn enough to make a film.

The group seemed to agree that, at least for the near future, most motion pictures that might be used effectively to raise humanistic questions -

whether for elementary and high school students, undergraduates, or general adult audiences - would have to be chosen from commercially made entertainment or documentary films. However, there was hope for the future that projects could be worked out which would involve the humanist as film-maker, or bring him/her together in partnership with the film-maker, in the production of films for teaching.

Asking Others

There was also general agreement that more sharing of ideas and information was called for. Trying to explain the apparent hesitancy of people to cooperate in such efforts, Donald Staples explained:

> Anyone who has, as I have, driven into a strange town with someone else, who was driving, and said, "Why not stop and ask directions?" whereupon the driver's knuckles turned white on the wheel, knows that it's not always easy to ask for help, because it is an admission of weakness of some type. Anyone who, as I have, has apprenticed in the film industry, knows it's not always easy for a person who has learned wonderful ways of dealing with problems to gladly pass them on to a potential hotshot competitor....I am reminded of David Paxton's favorite quote, "To be understood is to be found out."

Sam Grogg agreed with Staples that there was a great deal that humanists and film-makers could learn from each other, and provided an example:

> When I started reading psychology journals, in which psychologists were writing on film, I learned things that would never have occurred to me. There should be some effort to pull together bibliographical material, so that people in all disciplines might have an entree to film studies.

One of the current efforts of the A.F.I., Grogg remarked, was the perfecting of new ways to collect and disseminate all kinds of information dealing with film.

The End

Joel Colton thanked the participants for attending, and closed the conference with a reminder that consensus had not been the objective of the day's meeting. The idea, he stressed, had been to try "to bridge the gap between those in the traditional humanistic disciplines and people who have immersed themselves in film studies." In addition, the day-long

conversation had served to define more closely the problems and prospects for cinema studies and the humanities, and to suggest some basic areas of agreement among humanists who advocate the study of film both as an art form and as a popular mode of cultural expression.

BASIC ISSUES

In preparing the preceding narrative summary of a long meeting marked by wide-ranging discussion, an effort was made to retain the sense of the conversation as it developed, and to offer specific illustrations wherever possible. The following annotated list of twelve basic issues which emerged from the conference is intended to set out problems for further discussion. The list is not an exhaustive one, and is not intended to suggest that any of the issues itemized is more important than any other.

1. Academic Respectability. The struggle to win academic respectability for cinema studies as an independent area of knowledge has been won. The problem now appears to be concentrated in other academic departments (history, philosophy, literature, etc.) where those using film in their research and teaching are often considered by their colleagues to be less-than-serious scholars - the result being that they often fail to earn credit toward promotion and tenure for their work with film.

2. The Availability of Film. Commercial film distributors have many films for rental which are seldom if ever used, while teachers rent and screen the same movies semester after semester. Efforts should be made through a national organization such as the A.F.I. to make the most often used films more easily and inexpensively available. Distributors' catalogs should be made more accessible (in libraries, for example), and regional conferences should be sponsored so that teachers can preview films for their classes. Other possibilities for providing access to film materials may include the organization of regional consortia, each with a "core collection" of most-used films, and the wider use of public library collections.

3. Selected Lists of Films on Humanistic Themes. One way to help teachers locate different films would be the preparation of filmographies on various themes. Such lists might be annotated to evaluate films, as well as to organize them into subject categories. There is some opposition to this idea by those who argue that such lists are bound to limit the films likely to be used by teachers. If selective filmographies are prepared, critics warn, they should be made descriptive rather than prescriptive.

4. Hardware in the Classroom. Present day classroom projection equipment leaves much room for improvement. It breaks down too easily and damages film too readily. Part of the problem may be due to the teacher's lack of training with the equipment.

5. The Availability of Print Sources about Film. Too little attention has been paid to creating collections of books, periodicals, and manuscript materials that relate to the art and history of the cinema. Students in cinema studies ought to be able to use a card catalog and a reference shelf as well as a Steenbeck viewer. (Conversely, graduate students in history, literature, philosophy, and other disciplines should be introduced to film and visual communications as part of their professional training.)

6. Film as a Part of the Humanities. The study of cinema is emerging as a humanistic discipline in its own right, worthy of comparison with other more established and traditional fields. Participants in the creation of this new area of knowledge are most excited by the innovative opportunities open to them, and the new perspectives offered on other studies such as history and literary criticism. One problem may be the development of methodologies and vocabularies so technical as to be incomprehensible to most undergraduates who are not film majors - and also to some colleagues in other fields. There is also the unique difficulty faced by the scholar who has to rent his study material from a commercial distributor for one screening at a time.

7. Film Studies and "Visual Literacy." Some disapprove of the term, but most agree on the need to train students to be "visually literate," particularly in a society such as ours, in which so much information is transmitted through the visual media. What needs special encouragement is the teaching of the basics of film language and visual communications to non-majors in cinema studies.

8. What is the Impact of Television on Education? Does television create visual awareness, or does it serve to desensitize and dull the perceptions of viewers? It is interesting that some students complain that film courses often ruin TV for them in the future; they cannot watch without analyzing what they see.

9. Methodologies for Classroom Study. What should be the role of the teacher in introducing students to film? Is there a "proper response" to a particular film, or should the student be encouraged to relate freely to the viewing experience with no obtrusive introductions or conclusions drawn by the teacher? All agree that it is a terrible mistake to show a film that fills an entire class period and then move on to another subject the next day. But many teachers are still perplexed by the question of "what to do when the lights go on."

10. Film Study for Children. Whether the film is used to help them learn philosophy or history or to acquire "visual literacy," it is generally agreed that students should be working with motion pictures and learning to relate to them in primary and elementary schools. The understanding of some basics of visual communications may mean much more to young people if such lessons are learned at a time when they are still learning how to think critically. By the time they get to college much of this opportunity might have been lost.

11. What Should be the Role of National Professional Organizations? If advocates of film studies in the traditional humanistic disciplines are to gain the scholarly respect their work deserves and receive encouragement to continue, support should come from national professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association, the American Historical Association, The American Philosophical Association, and so on. Some improvement is evident in the increasing number of sessions at annual meetings that deal with film, but more positive action seems necessary to answer this nagging problem. As the most important national organization devoted to film, the A.F.I. deserves special attention. There are three areas in which the Institute is currently concentrating: (1) the preservation and archive function, (2) the A.F.I. catalog, and (3) the plans for an introductory course on American cinema (for programming on public television) which will provide supplementary materials for film teachers. Other suggestions might include the setting up of a toll-free telephone number to answer general reference questions about the availability of specific films from rental agents; the establishment of a union catalog of film periodicals,

reference works, and manuscript sources relating to cinema; and the devotion of a greater portion of American Film (the Institute's monthly magazine) to matters of concern to scholars rather than giving so much attention to current Hollywood releases.

12. The Production of Film for the Humanities. Is it desirable to produce films especially for the humanities classroom or would teachers do better using films originally made for entertainment or other commercial reasons? If films are to be produced with the humanities teacher in mind, how much input do traditional humanists want and how much should they have? Should specialists in other areas such as history, philosophy, literature, and anthropology be encouraged to become film-makers, or would it be more productive to concentrate on cooperative enterprises between professional film-makers and academic scholars, such as those being undertaken at Yale's Media Design Studio?

SELECTED REPRINTS

The articles reprinted here are meant to serve as examples of the different theoretical approaches which specialists in the various disciplines have applied to their work with film. The similarities and differences that mark these several methodologies indicate that humanists are sure to benefit from what their colleagues are doing and how they are going about it. The article by William Arrowsmith is especially valuable because it presents so well the rationale for the study of film within the context of a traditional humanities orientation. The selections that follow illustrate some of the ways that scholars have tried to fulfill these possibilities in history, American studies, literature, philosophy, and anthropology.

FILM AS EDUCATOR

William Arrowsmith

In humanistic education the future lies with film. Of this I am firmly convinced. I do not mean by this either "audio-visualism" or educational filmstrips. I mean that film will be not only the future medium of instruction, but that film also will challenge and eventually claim the place and prestige accorded to literature and the arts in the traditional curriculum. In short, film not merely as medium but as curriculum, too. This conviction rests upon a faith that human society cannot do without the humanities, cannot forsake its faith in the project of making men more fully human, helping men to "become the thing they are." If real education - and not merely the transmission of knowledge - is to take place, a curriculum is required which corroborates and exemplifies moral discovery, the making of a fate, the hunger for identity. Literature and the arts have always been at the heart of the humanities because they provided just such corroboration; our most enduring use for art has been precisely in education - and it is an end worthy of art, this "expansion of love beyond ourselves," which Nietzsche called education.

But I recognize, with distress and sadness, that this literature which is for me so crucial a curriculum that I cannot imagine my life without it, is for others, especially many young people, no longer at the center of things. It has come to seem to them artificial, even faintly anachronistic; its conventions suddenly seem conventional, labored, and unreal. Its crucial illusion crippled, participation becomes constrained or even impossible. This constraint comes not only from the comparative spaciousness and realism of the new media, the superior complexity and power of their conventions, but also from the way in which literature is too often taught; that is, as technical or professional virtuosity or as a decorative cultural "accomplishment." We have become very adept, as Edgar Friedenberg points out,

Reprinted from Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. III, No. 3, (1969): University of Illinois Press, Urbana, pp. 75-83.

"at driving cadmium rods into the seething mass of our cultural heritage and rendering it inactive."[1] The schools do it by castrating art, by disguising its true subversiveness, or by forcing it to yield a crop of acceptable cliches. The universities do it by treating literature as though it were written not for our enjoyment and instruction, but as part of a curriculum, for analysis and instruction.

The constraint students feel with literature has noticeably increased as scholarly attitudes have moved from the graduate schools to the undergraduate and even the secondary curricula. Constraint now becomes the rule; the student begins to suspect, resent, and reject a literary culture and education that flourish apparently for their own sakes or for their professors', without pertinence to his life. And so the conventions that support the art of the spoken word - the artificialities that used not to trouble us, that we took in our stride once - begin to seem dubious and then to dissolve. One no longer feels the necessity of the style, or its necessities are no longer ours. Constraint is not easily unlearned; and poetry and drama seem now no longer second nature, but come to us increasingly touched by the self-consciousness of all high culture that has been educationally formalized. I have heard Jesuits say that they could not teach in clerical garb, because the authority of their robes tainted the subjects they taught, troubling education with the problems of resented or refused authority. It is the same with the spoken arts in education; what is bad and merely authoritative or professional in education has corrupted them and weakened their enabling conventions. They no longer speak to us naturally, and our responses are becoming fatally self-conscious. Or so it seems to me.

Film itself may be highly self-conscious, but it is surely unique in possessing audiences who take it naturally, who attend to it without fuss or pretense or shame; who for the most part trust its makers and feel unmistakably at ease with its conventions. People go to movies as they go to take a bath or a stroll. You cannot assume that one

[1]The Humanities in the School, ed. Harold Taylor (New York: Citation Press, 1968), p.145.

student in ten has read a given book; chances are high that half the students will have seen - and seen well, or at least intensely - any film you care to mention. What is more, students see films with a natural confidence, a confidence unembarrassed by the grosser kinds of self-consciousness. By comparison, audiences for poetry, drama, or music are notoriously unsure, inclined either to dogmatic arrogance or deferential ignorance. The fear of the expert - the academic expert above all - hovers over them. But in film the climate is freer, more tolerant. The experts have not yet invaded the film and claimed it "No Trespassing - For Experts Only. Everybody Else Get Out!" as scholars have done with the Renaissance and musicologists with baroque music; or in literature where one sees the sad spectacle of writers and periods that were once of enormous seminal significance to the general reader and that, thanks to the claims of scholars, and the reluctance of the non-expert to take on the expert, have been rendered almost wholly useless and inaccessible.

In this openness and exemption from the self-consciousness of "high" culture lies the enormous promise of film. Its technical possibilities are, of course, staggering, but they would have almost no significance unless the audience could accept them easily and naturally within the context of conventions that audiences feel at home with. Indeed, one of my fears in the wave of technical experiment in film now is that the experiments may succeed in making the audience as killingly conscious of the camera and mere technical artifice as they are now mostly unconscious of it, content to accept a tale or a visual sequence as though it possessed its own internal necessity and could no more be questioned than wind on water. In saying this, I run the risk of offending those who are eager to see film accorded an equal place - i.e., a technical place - alongside the other arts. But the unique situation of film is surely that it comes to us, not as part of our educationally acquired "high" culture, but as part of the common culture itself.

It may be that films are still a part of common culture because film began not as an art but as an industry, and for a long time refused

to be taken, or to take itself, seriously. But whatever the reason, the film-maker enjoys in this respect a precious advantage over all his peers in the other arts. Only he has a real hope of creating on this basis an art which is not only great but also popular. What the novel was to the nineteenth century, the film might be to the twentieth: the genre, the only genre wholly congenial to the majority of a culture. In ancient Greece tragedy was just such a genre - popular, democratic, of enormous appeal to all classes; anything but the tiresome Mandarin nonsense it has become in modern production. Even in Italy as late as thirty years ago Italian opera was an unmistakably popular art form; you heard it as a matter of course on bar radios and in piazzas, interspersed with vivid comment. Now the same music brings dismay and anger and cries of Abbassa la radio! This currency, this conventional acceptability and viability belong, as I say, uniquely to film. And they suggest just how enormous an influence film might come to exert throughout the culture.

I said earlier that film would come to prevail in the educational curriculum of schools and universities, and that it would do so not only as a medium but also as a curriculum. It will be able to do this, I suggest, precisely because it is itself still a part of common culture and therefore can be meaningfully utilized in programs of general education. At present, general education is in disrepair and disesteem throughout the learned world. But general education was not defeated by its own inadequacy but by the professionalization of universities. Specialists cannot, for obvious reasons, confer a general education any more than plumbers can design a landscape. And general education in this country withered because specialists could not be persuaded to educate themselves or their students except as specialists. Yet our need for a valid form of general education is urgent, and grows more urgent all the time. We have learned recently how terrible is the cost to culture of its rejection by those who, because they have no stake in it, cannot use it. How, for instance can you meaningfully teach Greek tragedy - with its conviction of each man's freedom to find his own fate and his responsibility for it - to those who have never experienced such

freedom, who lack precisely the power to alter their fates or even to find them? You cannot. And what the ghetto child violently refuses, the middle-class child accepts because it is sugared with the promise of later material success. What we desperately need is a general education, a general curriculum, which could focus the realities of our present existence, present them as fact or hypothesis in a telling way - which could deal with our obsessions and tell the truth about our lives. Such a curriculum clearly must be designed and taught in such a way that it does not elicit irrelevant refusal or suspicion - that is, a curriculum whose style and conventions would seem, because shared by both teacher and student, to carry their own necessities, to require neither apology nor defense. That curriculum is film, a medium which is instantly acceptable, which provides, as reading does not, an immediate and shared experience of unparalleled intensity, which is still largely unencumbered by a scholarly literature, and whose vitality and future seem undeniable.

But it is not merely a matter of intensity and community. Here, after all, we have an art that is wholly available to the whole world, a truly ecumenical art. Given only subtitles, it is accessible to anyone, anywhere. And precisely because it <u>can</u> go anywhere, it tends to have, at least among the great directors, precisely the kind of ecumenical ambitions - the hope of reaching all mankind - that great writers, to some degree always imprisoned in the parish of their language, have hungered for. Even if the culture is formidably remote - Korean, say, or even Indian - the director can quickly and vividly familiarize it as no writer conceivably can. Yet the only purpose of familiarizing it must be to transcend what he has familiarized - to speak to <u>any</u> man in <u>any</u> place. Ecumenical ambitions may produce pretentious failures - but at least they will not produce a precious art. If there is little comfort in living in an age of violent change, of feeling only transitional, always uncertain of where one is or might be going, it is in such conditions, especially when they are universal, that we can hope for something like a Homeric vision, for a generous image of humanity. And the hope is measurably augmented when artists

of great talent - I think of Kurosawa and Antonioni - apply themselves to portraying the human psyche - its powers and weaknesses - as it strives to adapt to nearly unbearable change, to the destruction of the very ecology by which it was once - and may still be - fatally defined. This is, admittedly, a theme particularly suited to film, which can show with compelling beauty and detail the relation between psyche and ecology, which can re-create the old poetry of earth and the nightmarish new world in stunning proximity. But it is also one of the great universal themes - perhaps the great theme of the age - and it is, I think, no accident that it should be film - that ecumenical art - that is now attempting to treat it.

I know of no art with such potential for stating our problems, complexities, anxieties, and powers more naturally or comprehensively than film. And this is why film seems to me a natural curriculum - a curriculum-in-process, a creative project - with which to replace much of what we now do in literature and philosophy and humanities. At least film is where we might most intelligently begin, taking advantage of an existing motivation, of a living art form - in order to deepen and widen common culture. There is always the chance - doubtless high - that we shall stultify film in the process, but I cannot see how serious educators can fail to make use of the most powerful art-form that has ever existed, above all when that art has an unmistakable popular life. One would have to be mad not to use it. There is no way of guaranteeing that we shall not abuse it too. But, unlike the other arts, film is intrinsically interdisciplinary; it fuses all the existing arts in a new mode whose marvellous complexity will defeat all but the ablest academic critics. It is a medium congenial to ideas, and to present ideas above all, and its hunger for an ecumenical audience should, at least for now, keep it relatively honest. Ideally, I think such a film curriculum should be complemented by literature - literature which criticizes the film, or which is criticized or amplified by the film. For I assume that the past still matters enormously and still has things to teach us, and also that the past can be bettered by present achievement - and that this rivalry between dead and

living, this effort by the present to outdo the past - imitare superando - is supremely educational. In a time when the old are despised by the young, and the young feared by the old, it stands to reason that the past will seem irrelevant to the present. But surely it is not; certainly all education in the humanities is based on the premise of the relevance of the past to the present - that present which is, as Whitehead said, "holy ground."

The present is, like our culture, an oecumene. We are all ecumenical men and good Europeans these days. But the human oecumene runs backward too; it includes the dead, no less than Australian bushmen and the Hairy Ainu. And the dead are the vast majority. "Now that you're in Hell, Timon," the poet asks the famous misanthrope, "which do you prefer, the darkness or the light?" "The light, man. There are more of you here in Hell." The living are not diminished by honor done the dead. These, I suppose, are the pieties one expects of classicists, but I enter them as a protest against the jaunty McLuhanite modernity and the perky technical hybris of too many cineasts. Any valid general education should strive to keep past and present in constant creative and critical connection. Resnais's Hiroshima mon Amour, for instance, should be set against the poem it unknowingly, I suspect, imitates - the Iliad. And the point of the contrast should not be to batter the modern work with the ancient masterpiece, but to show why, in this case, in strategy and taste and power, the ancient work does so much more compellingly what the modern tries to do. Here, I would want to say, is a case of crucial cultural rivalry. Resnais attempted an honorable task; he attempted - probably unknowingly - the greatest theme of the greatest poet; a theme we badly need for our own time, and whose power and viability can be glimpsed in the passionate enthusiasm this rather poor film aroused among the young.

Or one might perhaps show how Antonioni, allusively and powerfully, attempts to create for film a visual vocabulary capable of taking what is still alive in the art of the past and renewing it in a fresh context. Thus in Blow-Up, when the photographer returns to find the corpse in the park, we see him look at the bare grass, the body gone, while

the leaves scatter in a fresh dawn wind around him; and he turns suddenly and looks upward, and the camera holds momentarily on the leafy branch overhead; nothing but the leaves and the wind-sound. And then at the close of the film, as the camera holds on the photographer, his eyes fill with tears as he turns, in the grip of a starker reality now, unable to participate any longer in the illusion of the mummers' tennis - turns and looks at the green grass. And then he too is gone, and there is only the grass left, under and behind the closing legend. Ephemerality, anonymity, the vision of man's days like the grass and the leaves, and the great Homeric figure: "As is the generation of leaves, so is that of men. One generation is born, and another dies ...." All these are in the aura of Antonioni's work. An aura of visual association, utterly without educated snobbery or pretense, a re-creation in cinematic terms of the oldest metaphors of human anonymity and impermanence in a world of change. In La Notte the same theme: the millionaire Milanese Trimalchio who seeks to leave a permanent monument; in the grass a battered marble Roman head, all permanence, gazed at by a fascinated cat, all animal transcience. In L'Eclisse, as Ricardo leaves Vittoria's apartment, one sees above the gate, perfectly squared in iron, an Umbrian landscape of the fourteenth century - the old poetry of earth framed by the imprisoning enclosures of the new megalopolis. In The Red Desert, the Sardinian beach fantasy, the girl, a brown and gawky adolescent, runs to hide, peering out from the green shrubbery; and she brings irresistibly to mind one of Gauguin's Tahitian girls - the cultural suggestion supporting the psychological purpose of the fantasy - the wonder and fear that accompany the arrival of "the other"; the waking out of oneself. None of these echoes, I stress, function for cultural show; they are rather Antonioni's way of using the past, transmuting it, and making it newly available, for contrast or for direct statement. In this respect, this attempt to affiliate himself in a cinematic - but not a literary - way to a great literary and artistic tradition, Antonioni is unique.

This, of course, is merely a suggestion of the sort of connection that can legitimately be found when past and present, literature and

film, are meaningfully juxtaposed. The result of such juxtapositions would be, it seems to me, to demonstrate one of the ideal relations of past and present and to show unmistakably the pertinence of the past, whether achievement or challenge. A legitimate form of general education could be created on the basis of the available film resources, and the effect of such education would be both to rescue literature and to enrich film. Let me say bluntly that I think the education of film-makers could be remarkably improved if they could be brought into a reasonably respectful and lively relation to past literature and the arts. I have the distinct impression that film-makers are all too often lamentably ignorant or even contemptuous of the literary tradition whose rightful inheritors they are. If they were not, they would not make many of the films they now make, and many of their dreadful adaptations of literary material would show either more respect for the original or more imaginative and radical adaptation than one now sees. And they would be bolder in appropriating material which is conducive to their ends. We need, in short, educated film-makers if we are to entrust the curriculum of education to them. I personally fail to see how one can legitimately expect to improve the training of film-makers except by educating them well in the great tradition of Homer, Sophocles, Plato, Shakespeare, and Racine. The achievements of film are already impressive, but they are not so impressive that we can lightly condone mere technical virtuosity combined with a radical illiteracy. The film-maker is as much the heir of literature as the American is the heir of Europe. But he lacks the humility to seize his inheritance, perhaps because, like most Americans, he cannot rid himself of his obsession with money and his populist assumption that literature and the past are either boring or bunk.

Let me close by saying that I think the mission of the film-maker goes far beyond mere artistic prowess or achievement. The film-maker alone has the opportunity, in conjunction with the other mass media, to reshape and reinvigorate the culture. The novelist has lost his chance; the poets and dramatists no longer have one. The educators have for the most part renounced education. And that means that the

great task of education in our times - the creation of a humane culture in its apparent absence or defeat - rests with the maker of films. Art is not enough. Or rather we need an art that can perform the task of education - the task that literature and the other arts once performed until they somehow lost the consent on which their power was based. The legacy of literature, however, is immense. What is required is the kind of sensibility that can seize it and transmute it to another medium, with equal power and simplicity and complexity, much as Montaigne and Shakespeare seized and transmuted the classical world they found in Plutarch, or as the Greek dramatists deliberately democratized the aristocratic ethos of <u>arete</u> they found in Homer and the poets. It is an art of translation that I am speaking of here - translation so accurate that it controls the matter and power of the original, and so radical that it utterly reshapes, transmogrifies, the values it discovers. You can transform great talent into genius only by energizing it in a task that requires exceptional powers, that makes talent transcend itself. Neither entertainment nor what we conventionally call art are likely to do it; we need a vision - and Vergilian powers in both artist and educator - that will transcend both art and entertainment. I suggest education, by which I mean both art and entertainment, be subsumed in a higher effort.

FILM STUDY AND THE HISTORY CLASSROOM

John E. O'Connor

Since 1895, when Auguste and Louis Lumiere put on the first public exhibitions of moving pictures, hundreds of thousands of films have been produced. The movies that survive as testament to that eighty-two year history of an art form - documentaries, theatrical features, serials, newsreels, propaganda films, training films, television commercials, and more - represent a tremendous storehouse of raw material for the history classroom. Each film is a historical artifact, a unique document for classroom analysis, and an effective tool for motivating students to consider all sorts of historical questions.

Perhaps the most productive approach to the use of film in the history class is to treat it as one would any other historical document. This requires that the teacher immerse himself to some degree in the study of film language and film art - something for which graduate school prepares very few historians. But the effort expended in learning to deal knowledgeably with film can yield significant results. Bringing film documents to students serves three principal purposes: (1) to give them practical experience in historical analysis and logical thinking, (2) to motivate them to study more traditional historical problems, and (3) to increase their awareness of the film experience by teaching them some of the basic elements of visual communications. This third purpose is based upon the premise that most of today's so-called "media-minded" young people do not comprehend even the first principles of how film and television communicate. Although some disciples of Marshall McLuhan will disagree, spending so many passive hours in front of the TV has lulled most viewers into suspending judgment and allowing themselves to be swept away into a sort of dream world. Rather than fine-tuning their analytical skills, they allow themselves to be hypnotized before the screen, taking in its messages uncritically.

Reprinted from American Historical Association Newsletter, Vol. XV, No. 3 (1977): American Historical Association, Washington, D.C., pp. 7-9.

Despite the belief of some teachers that showing a film in class represents a capitulation, an admission that the Gutenberg era really is dead, nothing could be further from the truth. What it does indicate is a realization that students are attracted to film and a belief that this interest can somehow be transferred to their study of history. Equally important, it suggests an awareness of the teacher's responsibility to help students develop the analytical skills necessary to seek out information, to verify it, and to evaluate it critically. Like most Americans today, students of the 1970s receive their everyday information more from the six o'clock news than from books, newspapers, or magazines. To close our eyes to this phenomenon would be the real capitulation. Reading comprehension is as important as ever, but teaching an understanding of visual perception and inculcating the skills of visual comprehension merit our attention as well.

Documentary films are of more obvious value as historical artifacts than theatrical feature films. Usually there is more to be learned from the "actuality" footage of a documentary than from the costumes and sets designed in a Hollywood studio. Naive to lens and lighting techniques and the tricks of editing, students at first may feel that they are seeing the actual historical events happen before their eyes. Discrimination takes place as the teacher asks searching questions and challenges students to look again. In the process students should develop a capacity for heightened visual awareness, and they may be fascinated by historical questions that seem meaningless and dull when approached through a lecture or a textbook.

Two documentaries I have used to good effect are The Plow That Broke the Plains, produced by Pare Lorentz for the United States Resettlement Administration in 1936, and See It Now: Report on Senator McCarthy, Edward R. Murrow's expose of Joseph McCarthy aired by CBS in March 1954. Each running about thirty minutes, these films are readily available, convenient to use, and quite inexpensive. What makes them especially interesting examples is that in at least some small way, in addition to illustrating historical developments, they helped to shape them.

A pertinent question to be asked about any historical document concerns its authorship. The Plow That Broke the Plains was made under the auspices of the United States government. Its purpose, as spelled out in the official records of the sponsoring agency, was to publicize the activities of the Resettlement Administration, the agency responsible for finding new homes for families forced off their farms by the environmental calamities of the middle thirties. The film purports to tell the true story of the Great Plains by tracing its settlement, first by cattlemen in the 1880s and then by hardy homesteaders who could find no vacant land elsewhere. They suffered in the semiarid climate where cyclical dry spells withered their crops, but they survived until World War I when soaring grain prices tempted farmers and unscrupulous land companies to overexpand production in marginally tillable lands. During the war and in the early twenties they plowed the plains so extensively that the next time drought came there was no grass to hold the soil, and it blew away. The closing sequences of the film show caravans of migrants, made homeless by the swirling dust, joining "the great army of the highway," looking for "a chance to start over." The implication was clear. The Democratic administration in Washington was sensitive to their plight and the Resettlement Administration was meant to help them.

The next logical question about a document refers to its audience; who saw the film and how did they react to it? Although film critics voiced acclaim, The Plow That Broke the Plains became the focus of a controversy between the administration in Washington and Hollywood producers who feared government competition in the movie business - similar to the power companies' reaction to the T.V.A. - and who responded by discouraging commercial exhibitors from booking the film. Democratic politicians liked the movie, and several incumbents used it to impress voters in their 1938 bids for reelection to Congress. Republicans correctly perceived it as propaganda for F.D.R. and his New Deal program. But the most serious criticism came from inside the Resettlement Administration itself, from agents stationed in still

fertile sections of the Great Plains where dust storms had been no problem. They charged that the film misrepresented conditions by generalizing about the area, and ultimately their arguments served to support Republican efforts to have the film withdrawn from circulation.

By the time all this has been brought out in class, perhaps discovered by the students themselves as they study memoranda reprinted in Richard D. MacCann's The Peoples' Films: A Political History of U.S. Government Motion Pictures (New York, 1973), they should be anxious to reevaluate their first impressions of the film. If time permits it might be screened again, or a sequence-by-sequence outline of the film might be prepared for class discussion. My own mimeographed outline of this film describing visual and oral components in side-by-side columns, runs to five pages.

Since The Plow That Broke the Plains is free of copyright restrictions, it is possible to videotape sequences or make 35mm slides of single frames for discussion by the class. The photography of the film is exquisite; many shots resemble the depression photo studies of Walker Evans and Dorothea Lange. The symbols and transitions (sledgehammers on fenceposts, newspaper headlines superimposed on whirring presses, phalanxes of tanks and tractors choreographed to World War I music) may appear clumsy and old-fashioned to a generation so overexposed to the technical skills of modern television, but this very characteristic makes them easier for film-study novices to identify and analyze.

Detailed structural analysis reveals more as significant historical questions emerge directly from the visual context of the film. For example, the 1920s are presented in a montage of belching smokestacks, overflowing grain hoppers, a jazz drummer, and a stockticker which teeters for a minute on its platform before crashing to the floor. Then the film cuts directly to the thirties, the depression, and the dust bowl. The visual implication (post hoc ergo propter hoc) is that the crash caused all the trouble. The opportunities for classroom research and study projects leap from the screen: What were the farmers' problems in the twenties and thirties? Did they start before

or after 1929? What, if anything, did the stock market have to do with them? What other sorts of images might have been chosen to portray the twenties? What were the real causes of the Great Depression and how did it affect urban and rural America differently? More generally, students might be asked to find out whether the pattern of western migration shown in the film was typical and challenge them to illustrate it with other non-film materials. They might also be prompted to consider the impact of inventions such as barbed wire and motorized farm machinery on the land and the people.

Equally effective in raising issues is Edward R. Murrow's See It Now: Report on Senator McCarthy. Most students have a vague conception of what McCarthyism means, but they have never seen more than a textbook photo of the man himself, and viewing the film brings him to life for them. There is considerable background information available about the production in Fred W. Friendly's book, Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control (New York, 1966). Here again, substantive historical questions emerge directly from the visual fabric of the film.

A sequence-by-sequence review quickly reveals how it was organized - first showing statements by McCarthy and then showing him contradicting himself. The film is filled with examples of the senator's tactics that shock even today, such as his reference to candidate Stevenson in 1952 as "Alger, I mean Adlai" and his badgering of State Department official Reed Harris before his Senate committee. But in the process of putting together the film clips to show the senator in the worst possible light, Murrow seems to have fallen into some of the same techniques used by the man he was exposing. Sections of McCarthy's speeches were taken out of context, and certain sequences appear to have been included more because of the expression on the senator's face or the tone of his voice - at one point a silly little laugh makes him appear to be insane - rather than the substance of what he had to say. Other sequences - his response to a testimonial dinner, for example, where he sputters and shuffles his feet for a minute or two before admitting to be speechless - seem to have been included primarily to embarrass McCarthy. They tell us nothing of the methods

he used or of the real dangers his movement represented. The fact that the film has been credited with helping to turn public opinion against the senator just a few weeks before the commencement of the Army-McCarthy hearings makes it all the more interesting. The film can become the center of an entire unit on McCarthy and the fifties and in the process help to sensitize students to the techniques of communicating visually.

There is a place in the classroom for almost every kind of film document. As those who rummage about in the ruins of ancient civilizations discover immediately, some artifacts are inherently more valuable than others. But it almost always depends on the questions one is asking. Dramatized feature films may be of little value in studying traditional political or military history, but if the framework of a teaching unit is shifted slightly they too can become useful. The famous Odessa steps sequence from Sergei Eisenstein's Potemkin, for example, is fabricated history - it never actually happened. But the film provides dramatic insight into what the Soviet government which sponsored the film wanted its people to think and feel about the czar and its troops. In addition, it is a beautiful example of the way in which a filmmaker can translate political emotions onto a moving strip of celluloid. The motives of Hollywood producers over the years have had far more to do with profits than propaganda, but the productions of their "dream factory" can be at least as valuable as the novels of a given period for helping the students to develop a feeling for the time. Here again, historians should take care to preserve the integrity of the film as a work of art. They should encourage their students to consider the background of production and audience response, and study the film's visual context as well as its surface subject matter. In short, film deserves the same attention as you would give to any other historical document.

Rather than simply generalize, I have gone into detail about specific films here to accentuate the special values of film study to the history teacher. To be sure, this is only one approach; educational films designed specifically for history classes can be useful

too. But teachers should become more aware of the vast stockpile of visual historical documents available for classroom use. They can help teachers generate interest in history while at the same time serving to train students and teachers alike to comprehend more fully the popular media of the present.

*The Plow That Broke the Plains can be rented inexpensively from many commercial film outlets or it may be purchased from the National Audiovisual Center, Washington, D.C. 20409, for about $70. See It Now: Report on McCarthy is available for three-day rental at $20 from the CBS Publishing Group, 600 Third Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016. For further reading on film history and analysis, and their applications to the classroom see Teaching History With Film by John E. O'Connor and Martin A. Jackson, pamphlet #2 in the AHA series "Discussions on Teaching." The bibliographies and lists of film distributors printed there merit attention.

THE AMERICAN DREAM ON FILM

James C. Curtis & J. Joseph Huthmacher

The purpose of this course was to delineate the characteristic ingredients traditionally associated with the American national character, the American creed, and the American dream. These include rugged individualism, material abundance, competition, conformity and the all embracing concept of American mission. The course explored how and to what extent the Dream has materialized for various segments of the American populace (immigrants, workers, American Indians, Black Americans and the "marginal men" on the contemporary scene). The strain, stress and conflict within individuals and between groups that arise because of the disparity between dream and reality was treated along with their manifestations in psychological reactions, social disorder, politics, confrontation and violence.

The course content consisted of assigned weekly reading, lectures and Hollywood feature films. Topics for lectures, film titles and reading assignments are listed on the following pages.

There were no exams on the course material. Instead, students wrote three papers (5-7 pages each) on the problems raised by the course material. These papers were to draw together the films, lectures and readings in an examination of a particular facet of the American Dream. Comparisons between films were encouraged so long as there was adequate supporting data from lectures and assigned readings.

There was opportunity for discussion after each film. Attendance at these sessions was voluntary. A panel of class members led each discussion. Those selected as panel members were excused from writing one of the three papers.

There seemed to be general agreement among all involved that the course was a huge success. Many students have asked that the course, or another one like it, be offered again, but thus far limitations on

Reprinted from Film and History, Vol. III, No. 3 (1973): New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, pp. 17-19.

staff, T.A.'s, etc. have not afforded an opportunity, although both instructors would be willing and happy to do the course again. Papers seemed to be the best method for grading, and although reading and grading them was a tremendous task for the two instructors and one T.A. who ran the course, students seemed satisfied that the method and grades were fair. Fifty-seventy students stayed regularly after for the discussions which were very fruitful. Evidence indicated that the students did the reading assignments also, which was gratifying, and helped disarm departmental critics and skeptics.

Date:	Lecture:	Film:	Readings:
9/5	The Old American Creed	At the Circus Marx Brothers (1939)	
9/12	Rugged Individualism	Shane (1953) Alan Ladd, Brandon DeWilde	Potter, People of Plenty, xi-72 Turner, "Significance of the Frontier in American (1893) History" (Bobbs-Merrill pamphlet) (complete)
9/19	People of Plenty	Mr. Deeds Goes To Town (1936) Gary Cooper, Jean Arthur	Potter, People of Plenty, pp. 75-208
9/26	Competition: An American Fetish	Downhill Racer (1969) Robert Redford, Gene Hackman	Wyllie, The Self-made Man in America (complete)
10/3	Conformity	Man in the Gray Flannel Suit (1956) Frederick March, Gregory Peck	Whyte, The Organization Man (pp. 1-152)
10/10	Nonconformity within the Conformist Mold	Cool Hand Luke (1967) Paul Newman, George Kennedy	Roszak, The Making of a Counter Culture (complete)
10/17	The American Mission	Wilson (1944) Alexander Knox	Gardner, Morgenthau, and Schlesinger, The Origins of the Cold War (complete)

ate:	Lecture:	Film:	Readings:
0/24	Immigration in American History	America, America (1963) Many Immigrants	Handlin, The Uprooted (complete)
0/31	Status Politics	The Last Hurrah (1958) Spencer Tracy, Jeffrey Hunter	Stave, Urban Bosses, Machines, and Progressive Reform (complete)
1/7	ELECTION DAY--HOLIDAY	NO CLASS----VOTE EARLY AND OFTEN!!	
OTE SKEFFINGTON!!			
1/14	The Labor Movement	On The Waterfront (1954) Marlon Brando, Lee J. Cobb	Chinoy, The Automobile Worker and the American Dream (complete)
1/21	A People Shorn of Its Culture: The American Indian	Tell 'em Willie Boy is Here (1970) Robert Blake, Robert Redford	Brown, Bury my Heart at Wounded Knee (complete)
1/28	Black Stereotype in Films	Cabin in the Sky (1943) Ethel Waters and a cast of thousands	Curtis and Gould, The Black Experience in America, Chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4.
2/5	The New Black Image	Nothing But a Man (1964) Ivan Dixon, Abby Lincoln	Curtis and Gould, The Black Experience in America, Chaps. 5, 6, 7, 8.
2/12	Marginal Americans	Grapes of Wrath (1940) Henry Fonda	Harrington, The Other America (pp. 1-170)

"HOW DO WE TEACH IT?": A PRIMER FOR THE BASIC LITERATURE/FILM COURSE

Dean Wilson Hartley

We read a book. We view a film.

Or do we? Should we?

And if so, how do we bring the two forms - literary and cinematic - together in the classroom.

These two related questions are relevant to university English faculty who are seeking broad new dimensions within the discipline itself, dimensions as relatively unexplored in the 70's as were, say, American Studies 20 years ago, or Afro-American Literature a mere 10 years ago. We have little control over the reasons why these questions are so relevant now; we can only seek to understand them.

Forces which are sweeping through academe with the impact of a new historical Zeitgeist have, as in the past, altered our perceptions about what and how we teach our literature courses. Once again, barriers are going down, boundaries slowly inching back under the pressure of these complex forces. Let me summarize them briefly: First, the tremendous contemporary interest in film among all levels of students and all grades of English and Comparative Literature faculty. Second, the displacement of the concept of film as a mere "A/V Device" suitable for pious bio-pics, for "illustrating" literary classics with stiffly-mounted period pieces, or for tracing the convoluted sex-life of the paramecium. Third, the burgeoning and - considering the variable quality - terrifying realization that for the past forty years, the annual average output of Hollywood film production alone has drawn from 45-60% of its production schedule of "A" pictures from literary adaptations. Finally, the availability of relatively inexpensive rental prints of 16mm versions of domestic and foreign films, with a consequent impact on all four years of the college

Reprinted from Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 1 (1975): Salisbury State College, Maryland, pp. 60-69.

curriculum. One might cite an addendum here: the number of film study groups, film series, subscription showings, and festivals, each of which has encouraged its audiences to discuss works ranging from 42nd Street to the Apu Trilogy with - to borrow Matthew Arnold's felicitous phrase - a "high seriousness" unlooked for in audiences of Hollywood's heyday.

What, then, are the main arguments in favor of integrating a course on film adaptation into the college or university English curriculum? And what are the problems which inevitably harass the enthusiastic novice as he sets out making the cumbersome machinery of his hyphenated literature-film unit work for him? In short, where and how do we begin to structure the basic course in film adaptation?

II

Before discussing the preparation that such a complex course would involve, with its potential for spawning other, related units (such as an interdisciplinary course in film production, co-sponsored with an Art Department) and spin-offs (such as a campus-wide film series), we should consider the assets of taking on this new kind of work-load. What will it do for us, for our students, for the department, and for the campus itself? There are, it seems to me, six positive possibilities inherent in introducing the beginning film adaptation course on the college level. These assets enable us to bring literary works - fiction, poetry, and plays - into tighter focus and into a larger frame than we have previously been able to manage with existing teaching methodologies. There are, of course, several problems involved in developing such a course. But none of these problems is insuperable, given adequate preparation by even the rankest coordinator.

Under the heading of "arguments in favor of developing and proposing such a course" we have the following six points in favor of linking books and films: the cross-class and cross-discipline appeal of the course subject; the "excitement" of the film medium; the sense of communal activity; the contrast of modes; the illumination of text by means of image; and the use of film as a catalytic agent.

First, the cross-class and cross-discipline appeal of the course subject. Speaking from my own experience as a former Assistant Professor of English at Wittenberg University, a small (2400), private, largely middle-class institution in Springfield, Ohio, I found that my introductory film/literature course, "The Novel on Film," held tremendous appeal for the Freshman through Senior class range. Even though the course was a 135 (Freshman level) offering, it attracted 32 students when the average enrollment for such a section was 22-25, and of that group, approximately 30% were students above the Freshman level. The percentage figures are not unusual; one finds that wherever the beginning film/literature unit is established as a Freshman elective, upperclass enrollment is surprisingly high.[1]

Second, "the excitement of film." "Even immobilized," George Bluestone reminds us in Novels into Film, "the camera makes space pliable. More significantly, however, the camera can move, and its mobility has enabled it to achieve unprecedented effects."[2] The over-powering image of the screen - whether a wide-screen or "dynamic square"[3] - sweeps away distractions and dominates viewer-consciousness. What we see on the screen is vital and immediate; it holds us as few books can. Furthermore,

[1] The enrollment figures for two subsequent Freshman-level 135 sections of film-adaptation courses reveal even higher percentages of upperclassmen; the Fall, 1972 term offering, "American Novels and Plays on Film," had solid 50% non-Freshman enrollment, and the Winter term, 1973 section, "British Novels, Plays and Poems on Film" showed a 60% enrollment of upperclassmen. Of these percentages, which are, admittedly, roughly worked out and rounded off, approximately half of the non-Freshman students were Junior and Senior non-English majors.

[2] George Bluestone, Novels into Film (Berkeley: UCB Press, 1968), p. 15.

[3] Eisenstein's term, which gained currency in Hollywood in the early 30's during the Russian filmmaker's unhappy tenure there. The "dynamic square" was held up by cost-cutting studio heads as an argument against introducing either the "Grandeur Screen" or Abel Gance's "Triptych" screens to theater owners. Costs, in the early 30's would have been prohibitive for installation of such screens, especially in the wake of the expensive changeover to sound equipment in American theaters.

although we may put a book down for the purposes of a meal, a telephone call, the bathroom, or reflection on what we have just read, it goes against convention to walk out of a film - the cinematic equivalent of "putting down a book." When we watch a film, we do not reflect; we absorb. That is, we permit our consciousness - the monitor of our needs and activities - to be overwhelmed by the sensory overload. The screen story is an experience involving eyes and ears - double the sensory input we get from reading literature. The sheer size of the screen itself on which the story unfolds, sixty times larger than life-size, surrounds and engulfs us; in our passive contemplation of its activity, we lose our own identities.

Third, "the sense of communal activity." The film breaks the one-to-one ratio between the student and his book or the student and the teacher discussing that book. A cinematic adaptation of a novel, poem, or play involves a whole community of catechumens. It becomes a shared experience in which our reactions are anticipated, programmed, and unleashed at key points by means of film techniques and editing rhythm in almost metronomic fashion. One may demonstrate this effect by synchronizing Bach's "Tocatta and Fugue in D Minor" with the Lincoln Assassination (Ford's Theater) sequence in Griffith's Birth of a Nation. Frame for frame, the sequence duplicates the carefully controlled complexities of the Bach work for an overwhelming impact on the viewer, uniting him in a single, shared crescendo of emotive response comparable to the effect elicited by Bach, alone, in the concert hall. The audience is drawn closer to the experience being represented than it would be during a classroom discussion; therefore, it collectively comprehends the nature of that experience with what may be described as a mass consciousness: twenty, fifty, or a thousand pairs of eyes and ears function better than one pair. Furthermore, one learns from watching a film because others respond; the senses are sharpened by proximity and unanimity of response. The responses of the group are insightful and instructive; sharing the communal experience in the darkened theater, classroom, or auditorium, the individual absorbs the sense of the work at a much faster rate than he does while merely reading or discussing it.

Fourth: "the contrast of modes." Fictional, poetic, and dramatic narratives use time chronologically, historically, and psychologically, as do film narratives. But literary narratives are hampered most often by the necessity of moving forward and backward in time, with the consequent use of relatively crude technical devices to enable the reader (or, in the case of plays, the viewer) to follow the transitions in the story line or character development. In reading, eyes move across the page, left to right, then drop a line and repeat the process, as if the brain were a typewriter - which it is not. On the stage, scenery is shifted, the curtain rung down between acts, and delays - called conventions - dictate the interruption of the story line and the fragmentation of communal audience consciousness. Film narrative moves not only in the continuous present, but, more important, continuously. We have a sense of the passage of time, but we, the audience, are always "in the present day" because the film transposes the temporal narrative of the period novel such as Gone With the Wind or Pride and Prejudice into spatial and visual terms. Our eyes, deceived by the illusory, third dimension of the screen, are constantly focussing and refocussing on images which not only move - unlike the words on a page - but alter radically in size - unlike the sets and characters on a stage. Thus, we are totally absorbed by a film as we absorb it, without being aware of partfcipating at all. We are not, therefore, passive readers of the one-dimensional page before us, but denizens on the screen itself.

Fifth: "the illumination of the text by means of the image." The film condenses and illuminates difficult themes and passages for the literature student by finding the equivalent cinematic tropes for particular states of emotion, descriptive metaphors, and sub-verbal themes. The use of the range of camera angles - pan, close up, medium shot, long shot, tracking shot, high and low angle shots - enables the film-maker to emphasize the content of a scene objectively or subjectively, define point of view, establish tone, delineate character, and - through the use of rhythmic editing, or montage - determine the pace of the action.

"One picture is worth a thousand words": the cliche is given new life when one considers the fact that a page of description of Rebecca's beach house in the duMaurier novel was condensed by Hitchcock into one six-second 360-degree pan around the deserted cottage in the film version.

Sixth: "the use of film as a catalytic agent." The film is, finally, an incomparable catalytic agent. It mediates between the variety of reality - the multiple and overlapping views of the real world as we know it - and the orderly, aesthetically satisfying, but artificial approximation of that world that we find in literary works as formally and substantively diverse as Tom Jones, Suddenly Last Summer, and The White Cliffs of Dover. As Andrew Sarris has noted in "Literature and Film," film "is not only impure; it is incredibly promiscuous. Its range is wide; but its attention span is brief. At its best, it translates surfaces into essences."[4] The individual work of fiction is considerably less promiscuous; its range is narrow, limited by the consciousness and preoccupations of the author and still further by those of his characters, but its attention span is as flexible as the reader's. By the very objectivity of the film medium, a movie presents the most subjectively treated material of a novel such as Ulysses with a singular absence of commentary. We are not told or shown what to think or how to react by a film as we are shown or told how to react by the novel - and to a lesser extent, this statement may be applied to film adaptations of poems and plays as well. We must read into the film its meaning. The illumination of a fictional text on the screen involves our passive participation and our deepest emotions on a level unparalleled in the experience of reading fiction. We put into a film what we get out of it; thus we "read" a literary work on film more fully than we do the printed text itself.*

4 Andrew Sarris, "Literature and Film," MMLA Bulletin (Spring, 1971), p.14.

* Final sections of this article have been deleted. For complete article see reference p. 39.

PHILOSOPHY AND FILM

Jerry H. Gill

There are at least two reasons which justify an exploration of the relation between philosophy and film. The first is that film has become an exceedingly important cultural phenomenon in recent years, both as an art form and as a social catalyst. Thus there arises a need for a philosophy of film within and overlapping the traditional fields of aesthetics and social philosophy. The second reason is that film is most likely the primary "literary" background of today's college and university students. As it has become appropriate to examine philosophical ideas in literature, so it is now becoming appropriate to explore philosophical issues connected with film. Indeed, for those who are interested in teaching philosophy in a way that brings it home to contemporary students, such explorations are more than appropriate; they are necessary.

For several years now I have been offering courses which deal with the work of Ingmar Bergman from a philosophical perspective. It may be that others can profit from an account of the dynamic of this endeavor. I shall begin by introducing a three-fold distinction among the dimensions of a film, and then proceed to a suggestive exploration of the philosophical issues which relate to each of these three dimensions. I shall try to include some guidelines for understanding and discussing films per se, as well as ideas for approaching them philosophically. Occasionally, I shall refer to a Bergman film by way of illustrating a point. Hopefully his films are well enough known that this will prove helpful.

To begin, it is helpful to think of films as having three dimensions of meaning: the perceptual, the dramatic, and the metaphoric. Because of the widespread influence of film as a form of story-telling (in movies and television) and because the everyday world focusses on people and events, our initial and too frequently our entire involvement with a

Reprinted from Metaphilosophy, Vol. 8, 1977: SUNY at Albany, New York.

film is in terms of its dramatic dimension. In view of this fact, I find it imperative to begin the philosophical exploration of a film by the perceptual dimension. For not only is the dramatic dimension causally dependent upon the perceptual, but so very often the significance of the former can only be brought to light in relation to concrete perceptual observations. The metaphoric dimension can best be treated after the other two dimensions. It should always be borne in mind that while the analysis of a film must necessarily be sequential, the experiencing of a film is simultaneous and holistic. Thus, the overall interpretation must have a reciprocal dynamic which moves from the whole to the parts and back to the whole.

I

It is often fruitful to begin a discussion of the perceptual dimension of a film by asking the participants to share dominant and crucial images, sounds, and spatial and temporal patterns which they experienced. This overcomes the natural gravitation toward the dialogue -- and helps us <u>see</u> the film as a film -- while at the same time providing a concrete context for interpreting the dialogue.

A sizeable collection of such observations on the blackboard, perhaps arranged according to a pattern which suggests itself in the collecting process, provides an excellent base for further explorations. Next a consideration of such perceptual features as camera angles (pans and close-ups), motion or speed, use of color, and editing techniques (split screen, cuts, fade outs) is in order. It is surprising how quickly these sorts of observations can be gathered and how much improvement takes place in the student's ability to see and hear a film as more films are experienced and discussed.

There are many philosophical issues which can be brought to the fore during a discussion of a film's perceptual dimension. As might be expected, many of them center around epistemological questions, such as the reliability of the senses. The postures of Plato, Descartes, Berkeley, Hume, and Russell can be brought in to help focus the issues. Bergman's <u>Persona</u> is especially rich in perceptual detail and in crucial scenes it

trades on sensory ambiguities. Through a Glass Darkly also provides a point of departure for questions of who sees and hears what. In addition, the implications of the dominance of the visual image in film, as well as in the history of Western thought, may well be worth discussing. Moreover, the debate over the structure of perception itself, whether one perceives wholes (Gestalts) or parts (sense data) can be worked in at this juncture as well.

A larger issue may surface at this level of discussion, namely the nature of the relationship between the perceptual dimension on the one hand and the dramatic and metaphoric dimensions on the other hand. How is it that we discern the more complex dimensions of a film simply by being exposed to certain sensory images? Is it by inference, as Sherlock Holmes unravelled a mystery by collecting and rearranging clues in his mind? This is the standard posture of modern philosophy, be it empiricist or rationalist in character. Or do we directly intuit the richer significance by means of some special emotional and/or aesthetic capacity? Perhaps the views of Bergson, Tolstoy, and Langer would be relevant at this point. My own view, that the more complex dimensions are mediated in and through the less complex usually gets some exposure here, but by and large a more thorough discussion of this issue must be postponed until the other two dimensions of the film have been introduced.

Flowing out of such epistemological considerations as these are certain metaphysical questions. The particular nature of the work of the photographer and the editor in creating a film raises some crucial questions about the relationship between reality and appearance. Specific techniques are used to underline or contradict certain other aspects of the film -- sometimes those of the perceptual dimension and sometimes those of the other two dimensions -- and it is worth considering whether and to what extent this same phenomenon may not occur in our everyday experience, thus suggesting important difficulties in ascertaining what is real. The relativity of perspective and emphasis, along with the possibility of intersubjectivity overcoming the ego-centric predicament (solipsism) are integral at this point. One can also raise questions about the criteria to be employed in distinguishing between reality and appearance, first in

the film and then in everyday life. Idealism, materialism, realism, and pragmatism relate naturally to such discussions. Here again Persona is relevant, as is Cries and Whispers, because they both involve highly complex camera work and editing.

The above metaphysical excursions lead directly into a consideration of two central concerns in the philosophy of art. The first has to do with the relation between art and illusion. There are those aestheticians, such as E. H. Gombrich, who argue that the essence of two-dimensional visual art lies in the creation of the illusion that material reality is being represented. Some contemporary painters and film-makers, on the other hand, would contend that visual art creates its own, independent real world. Both of these positions differ from the classic imitation theory of art, whether in its representational (Plato) or presentational (Langer) version.

The second concern pertains to the relationships among the various art forms and/or media. To what extent do they participate in common elements? What are their distinctive features? How does film relate to painting, drama, and literature, and so on? Arnheim once argued, for instance, that film as an art form died when talking was introduced, since this led to story-telling movies and put an end to artistic experimentation in film. It can be maintained that while this may have been true for a while (although the revival of Fields, Bogart, and Howard Hawks among film connoisseurs would militate against even this concession) it is no longer the case. The rising interest in art films and experimental films over the past twenty years would seem to negate Arnheim's point.

Finally, before leaving the perceptual dimension it may be helpful to indicate some of the ethical issues which pertain to this level of exploration. Related to the questions about reality and illusion are those having to do with the film-maker's responsibility to the viewer. First off, is there any such responsibility at all? If so, in what does it consist? It might be contended that the artist's only responsibility is to his own vision and to his medium. But is not the determination of how well this latter responsibility has been met in part the responsibility of the viewers? Even granting that film traffics in illusion, are there not moral distinctions that can be made between various uses of

illusion? And what of the viewer's responsibility to the film-maker? Must she/he only pay her/his money and passively submit to the film, or can she/he be expected to bring something to the film as well? Bergman's The Magician raises questions about responsibility and art, both in its techniques and in its content.

II

With the foregoing information and discussions on the table it is possible to move to an examination of the dramatic dimension of the film in question. Once again it is advisable to begin with concrete observations, this time about such things as the use of space and timing in the scene structure, dialogue patterns, and basic facts about the story-line. Often it makes a great deal of difference, for instance, whether scenes take place indoors or outdoors, whether they all take place in roughly one setting or involve various forms of travelling, and whether or not the dialogue carries any essential information or especially significant patterns. The Silence focuses nearly all these issues. In it there is a strong contrast between indoors and outdoors, a journey through an unnamed country, and almost no sound track. Each of these factors makes a strong contribution to the film's meaning.

Next one can share observations about the main characters, the structure of the plot (alternating patterns, crucial turning points, climax, etc.), and overall tone and effect. Both Cries and Whispers and The Seventh Seal are strong on character typologies and dramatic development. At this juncture thematic and psychological factors begin to emerge and it is important to keep them focused on the film itself and reserve the discussion of their symbolic significance for a bit later on. Nevertheless, the particular aspects of the film's characters and plot must be examined and clarified. I find it helpful to diagram the main relationships among the characters and the overall development of the plot on the blackboard. To try to grasp these basic features in some simple schematic form greatly enhances the discussion.

Often the treatment of these elements leads directly into a consideration of ethical questions. One of the key moral issues frequently arising

in films is that of determining responsibility for the specific behavior and/or personality patterns of the characters involved. The delineation of individual responsibility calls for some discussion of the apparent difference between causes and reasons when explaining human action. At the same time the age-old problem of freedom and determination usually manages to crowd its way into any discussion of moral responsibility. Here Wild Strawberries and Passion of Anna come immediately to mind. Both seek to trace personal responsibility within the network of human relationships. Both linguistic analysts (e.g. Melden, Ryle, Malcolm) and existentialists (Sartre, Nietzsche, Camus) have a great deal to say about the former question, while the recent debates involving Skinner, et al usually enliven the treatment of the latter question.

Another related theme is that of arriving at a workable standard by means of which to establish the rightness or wrongness of a given act. The standard ethical theories can serve as a sounding board against which to compare the conduct of a film's characters. Here too the question of a definition of "the good life" becomes viable. In all such discussions the focus should be on the concrete events and personages of the film in question and only secondarily upon the views of the film-maker.

A question which forms a bridge between ethics and social philosophy is that of obscenity. The determination of the meaning of this notion in relation to the particular film under discussion may well be worth pursuing. Coming from the other side, the question of the viability of censorship in a society is as timely as it is perennial, and there is a wide variety of traditional postures and literature available, from Plato through Lenin and Mill. Moreover, there is a whole host of contemporary discussions of the subject, especially among literary artists and critics. All of this usually leads once again to the possibility of considering whether or not an artist has a responsibility to society or whether her/his only responsibility is to art. In their content Hour of the Wolf and Shame deal directly with this problem.

Another main field of philosophy is inextricably bound up with a consideration of the dramatic dimension of a film. This is the field of

metaphysics. Perhaps the most obvious point of connection is the world views that are embodied in the actions and utterances of the main characters. Very often the characters in a film tend to represent various types or postures vis à vis the world around them. These postures have definite metaphysical implications concerning which aspects of experience are the more real and why. Moreover, the interaction among the characters and the overall dramatic development of the film may well express a particular metaphysical point of view regarding the nature of reality and appearance. Lines of connection can be drawn between these postures and points of view and various standard metaphysical positions. The same sort of possibilities are available with respect to various approaches to knowledge that might be embodied in the individual characters or the film as a whole. The Seventh Seal, with its dialectic between the knight, his squire, and the holy family, is a classic in this regard.

Frequently in films there is a great deal done with the relationship between fantasy and reality. Often dreams take on special significance and there may even be cases where the remembrances and imaginative projections of key personages are extremely important. These phenomena raise questions about the viability of our normal distinction between reality and fantasy or dreaming, questions which are worthy of exploration and toward which there is a wide variety of philosophic attitudes. Wild Strawberries and Cries and Whispers have a number of crucial dream and/or fantasy scenes, as do Shame and Hour of the Wolf.

The above discussion leads into philosophical psychology and related issues in this field are those of personal identity and the problem of other minds. One of the more interesting and complex features of contemporary film-making is the attempt to portray both the behavior and the consciousness of the main characters. This suggests the many and difficult problems surrounding the notion of selfhood and the relationship between mind and body. Here again many standard philosophic points of view become relevant, as well as those of such contemporary thinkers as Ryle and Merleau-Ponty. It may even be that film-makers and the phenomenon of film itself may contribute valuable insights into these problems. Once again Persona comes to mind as a penetrating study in the notion of selfhood.

One final matter. Many films, either directly or by implication, touch on religious and theological questions. Sometimes the characters, events, and/or dialogue are overtly about such issues, while in other films the notions of God, faith, the church and the like are conspicuous by their absence. The dominant theme in many contemporary films is that of criticism or indifference toward religious concerns. As in most cases, however, there are serious philosophical questions that can be raised about the viability of the dominant or popular view. It can prove valuable to examine the sorts of reasons a film offers for the position or tone which it expresses; whether they are psychological, sociological, scientific, or philosophical in nature. Nearly all of Bergman's "middle period" films -- The Seventh Seal, Through a Glass Darkly, Winter Light, and The Silence -- deal with theological issues. Somewhat surprisingly he returns to these themes in a very recent work, Cries and Whispers.

III

When the first two dimensions of a film have been introduced and explored it is possible to move to the metaphoric dimension. Hopefully the previous discussions will provide both a stimulus and a tether for the consideration of the symbolic signification of a given film. For two extremes need to be avoided: the refusal to seek deeper and broader meaning in the film and the tendency to engage in ungrounded speculation. Those familiar with the principles and problems of literary and dramatic interpretation will be in a favorable position at this point, but it is important to remember that in addition to having things in common with these two art forms, film also must be understood as a visual art. Furthermore, its most unique characteristic is its use of motion. Thus, the task of film interpretation may well be the most complicated of any art form.

My own rule of thumb has been to view the symbolic possibilities of a film as partaking of metaphor in extended or story form, or as parable. This approach tends to avoid the temptation to give an allegorical interpretation of every film on the one hand and a surrealist interpretation on the other hand. Of course, there are films which should in fact be interpreted as allegories and surrealism, respectively. But the case must be made for viewing them in this way. A parabolic interpretation of a film works within the framework of metaphor in that it sees in

the film the possibility of light being cast upon a specific aspect of human existence when the two (the film and the specific aspect of human life) are brought into interaction with each other. A parable, as a metaphor in story form, has the advantages of increased vivacity and the presentation of a greater variety of facets than can be achieved with a simple metaphor. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that a parable essentially has but one major point to make. In my opinion this is the best way to approach all of Bergman's films, even his most recent and seemingly straight-forward Scenes From a Marriage.

Students usually grab on to the psychological characteristics of the personages in a film and extend them as symbols of certain ways of being in the world. Then they proceed to draw conclusions about what the film (and the film-maker) is saying about life from the dramatic development of the film. While this would seem to be as good a place as any to begin, care must be taken to ground such moves in the "stuff" of the previous two dimensions of the film. The discussion of such possibilities provides an excellent occasion for the discussants to probe their own life styles and moral postures. Once again the question of ethical responsibility will come to the fore.

Perhaps at this point it would be well to mention that one of the chief and most powerful aspects of film is its ability to draw the viewer into its world and to thereby provide vivid, vicarious experience. As with the theater, and to a lesser extent with literature, film allows the viewer to indwell other life styles and existential perspectives, and to thereby probe his/her own life in a deep and challenging manner. To put it slightly differently, film often raises issues having to do with the basis of human existence so forcefully that the viewer is put under heavy pressure to evaluate his/her view of life. Thus the natural congruence between film as an art form and philosophy, wherein "the unexamined life is not worth living."

All of these considerations bring to the surface a crucial issue in the philosophy of the dramatic arts. Since the time of Aristotle it has been common to think of the purpose of drama as providing emotional release

(catharsis) for the viewers. In recent years it has become more popular to think of the dramatic arts as a vehicle for the artist to express his/her feelings. The Marxist position is that all the arts ought to challenge the viewer to a better embodiment of the ideals of the state (or of the revolution). Another recent view is that the dramatic arts should be thought of as providing a dialectic prod for the self-exploration of the viewer. Each of these approaches can be profitably discussed in terms of its application to a given film.

One final matter merits attention. The question of the parabolic character of the symbolic dimension of film calls attention to an important epistemological problem. As I indicated in the first section of this essay, it is worth discussing the exact nature of the process by means of which we move from the particulars of the perceptual dimension to the "middle sized" phenomena of the dramatic dimension, and then from both of these on to the metaphoric dimension. Two of the more common positions are that we make this more by inference and that we do so by some form of direct intuition. My own approach has been to develop the notion of mediation as a richer and more holistic epistemological model for understanding various forms of cognition. Film analysis provides excellent opportunity to explore how the significance of more complex dimensions are mediated in and through the less complex, rather than being inferred or intuited.

The elements of the perceptual dimension are brought together on a richer level around a meaningful Gestalt by means of an integrative cognitive act. In the same way, the elements of the dramatic dimension are integrated into a richer meaning in the symbolic dimension. Only this way of conceiving of the dynamic in question fits with the parabolic model introduced earlier. The significance of a parable is not grasped by an inferential process, nor is it helpfully thought of as essentially mysterious or intuitive. The logic of parabolic understanding is that of engagement and interaction, while the logic of inference is objective analysis and that of intuition is complete identification or union between the knower and the known.

Although this is not the place to defend the notion of mediation, it remains the case that this is an important and interesting issue which flows naturally out of a discussion of the relationship between the three dimensions of film. Perhaps enough has been said to give some indication of how philosophy and film can be brought together in meaningful encounter.

Practical Information and Suggestions

I have found it fruitful to focus exclusively on the films of Bergman, but there are other film-makers, such as Fellini, Antonioni, Wells, etc. whose work is well worth exploring. I scheduled the equivalent of one Bergman film every other week in the semester. We viewed each one once in class and showed it once as an all-college film. One could work with fewer films and/or with important commercially shown films, depending on their availability. Instead of having the students buy several books of screenplays, criticism, etc., I have them buy only one book on film and one on Bergman. I then charge a $10.00 film fee to each person in the course and this usually guarantees about $500.00 to work with. One can also ask for 50¢ donations at the all-college showing.

It has been helpful to schedule several lectures by colleagues who can offer insight into film and/or Bergman, and I give a few on the nature of philosophy, etc. It is, of course, important to keep the discussion groups fairly small -- and to discuss each film at least twice (once after each viewing is preferable). In the discussions I touch on each of the three dimensions of each film, but I try to limit the number of philosophical issues we discuss. Others can be taken up in connection with other films. Ideally certain issues will surface naturally within the context provided by each film.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND FILM

The Social Science Implications of Regarding Film as Communication

Jay Ruby

Film study and instruction in production has, by and large, been concentrated in the arts and humanities in most American universities. This is a logical place for such training if one assumes that film is exclusively an art form. Viewed from this perspective, social scientists are only able to deal with film as one manifestation of the aesthetic output of a culture, that is, with the study of art.

However, one can regard film as Worth[1] and others have suggested, as a technology and medium of communication which contains articulated sign-events constructed and organized by makers, or in the words of my own discipline, anthropology, as a culturally specific symbol system which can be employed in a variety of ways to make statements about the world.

Once film is placed in this communication framework (which includes film as art) other perspectives are revealed which suggest that film can be utilized in three ways within the social sciences: film can be studied as a datum of behavior, that is, for what it reveals about the sociology, psychology, and anthropology of the makers; film can be used as a technological device to generate data on human behavior which can be subjected to a variety of scientific analyses; and film can be utilized as a medium for the presentation of social science research findings and theoretical statements.

The Translation of the Idea into a Curriculum

For a number of historical reasons, anthropology is probably in the best position to translate the above assumptions into a curriculum (cf.

[1]Worth, Sol. "Film As Non-Art," American Scholar, (35) 2:322-333, 1966.

Reprinted from Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Vol. 1, No. 4 (1976): Redgrave Publishing Co., Pleasantville, N.Y., pp. 436-445.

DeBrigard 1971 for a history of anthropology and film). While it is not possible to discuss all of the factors, it should be pointed out that anthropologists have been using the motion picture camera ever since 1896 (Regnault 1896). Since that time, it has become commonplace for anthropologists to take pictures - both moving and still - as part of their field work and even more common for anthropologists to use films in their teaching. Therefore, a visual anthropology is in a more developed stage when compared to similar movements in sociology or psychology.

Out of this tradition within anthropology, a particular curriculum has been developed at Temple University in Philadelphia. The teaching of visual anthropology at Temple has two larger contexts which, to some degree, define and give a specific focus to the training. The first is a departmental philosophy of graduate education, and the second is the fact that this training occurs within a program of graduate studies in culture and communication.

Graduate education in anthropology at Temple is based on the traditional assumption that anthropologists should have a foundation in all areas of their discipline - linguistics, archeology, and cultural and physical anthropology. Only after successful completion of general comprehensive exams are students encouraged to specialize. Students with an interest in film pursue their speciality within the broader context of the culture and communication program.

The program is designed to train students of anthropology who wish to study various modes of communication in a cultural context. The basic assumption underlying the program is that all communicative, interactive, and expressive forms of behavior are legitimate subjects of anthropological inquiry.

The approach to culture and communication proceeds from a particular view of both culture and communication. Culture is seen as a symbolic system which is generated by a set of rules shared by members of a society. These symbols are socially defined and hence, communicative in nature and function. Furthermore, the symbols can only be analyzed when both their underlying (generating) rules and their social contexts are considered.

Since communication is viewed as the use of codes (i.e., culturally defined patterns of symbolic behavior) in a social context, the analysis of communication systems and events suggests itself as a logical approach to explicating both the underlying rules of culture and the social contexts of symbolic behavior.

It should be emphasized that our commitment to the study of the ways people communicate in living situations and our interest in developing communication models for anthropological studies involves us in two separate, though related, enterprises. The first leads us to examine all the various modes of communication within single cultures and across cultures, and requires us to understand verbal and visual communication in social contexts. The second leads us to see cultural systems as sets of rules that permit the exchange of symbols. Substantively, the first enterprise leads us to study areas such as linguistics, vidistics, dance and ritual, while the second requires that we think of all culture as some kind of integrated set of circuits for the exchange of messages.

In dealing with the concerns outlined above, and making use of the resources available in our department, several major foci have evolved in the culture and communication program. They are:

1. The construction of models based on the analogy between cultural and communication systems, so that one can examine communication systems as culture and cultural systems as communication.
2. The consideration of methodological problems involved in the construction of these models.
3. The understanding of the nature, functions, and contexts of language as well as the adaptation and application of linguistic analysis (particularly sociolinguistics) to other modes of communication.
4. The study of religion and ritual is considered relevant to students of culture and communication, since both are analyzed as sets of rules for the exchanges of messages, as well as sets of messages worthy of study in and of themselves.
5. The exploration of non-verbal forms of communication, especially visual media.

The remainder of the paper will discuss the teaching of visual anthropology within this program. Visual anthropology should be conceptualized broadly enough to include: the study of human non-linguistic forms of communication which typically involves some visual technology for data collecting and analysis; the study of visual products, such as films, as communicative activity and as a datum of culture amenable to ethnographic analysis; and the use of visual media for the presentation of data and research findings - data and findings that otherwise remain verbally unrealized.

It should be understood that all areas of visual anthropology do not necessarily require the use of visual technology. However, most analyses are seriously handicapped without some mechanical means of replay for slow motion and repeated viewings. Hence, data are typically gathered with the aid of some visual mechanical device, such as a camera.

While recognizing the importance of technology for visual anthropology, the acquisition of competence in film production is regarded as a technical skill which some students may need to acquire in order to pursue their research and teaching goals. As a technical skill, film production is viewed like other skills, such as statistics or contour map-making - they are simply tools which have potential utility, provided a research design calls for them. It is realized that a basic understanding of film theory, construction, and filmic conventions is necessary for an understanding of film as a communicative medium. The film medium is thought of in terms of its limitations, advantages, function, what it can and cannot be expected to accomplish, and where the use of film is an indispensable aid to specific research interests. The general question that must be repeatedly asked is, what have you gained after using a visual medium that you would not have gained without it?

Significant scientific research problems for an anthropologist do not consist of how to get a better sound track, why a particular tripod does not swivel in the Arctic, or what is the best distribution company for a film. These technical questions become relevant after research has been designed which demands a methodological approach involving visual technology.

Some problems in visual anthropology that are intimately tied to the use of film include:

1. Microanalytic studies of human interpersonal behaviors, such as kinesics, proxemics, and tacesics, are generally aided by some form of visual evidence. In some courses, students have examined behavioral events such as greeting, interviewing, teaching, eating, and panhandling. In these cases, the camera and repeated projections act as extensions of the researcher's perceptual ability.
2. Visual technology may also be used in the study of macrounits of human behavior. Reference here is made to the production of motion picture footage of particular rituals, ceremonies, technological and/or artistic processes, socialization practices, subsistence patterns, warfare, etc. In this context, any visual manifestation of a culture is relevant subject matter.
3. In addition, the visual products of both professional and non-professional camera use can be studied as cultural artifacts. Images here are treated as data of a particular culture. This interest becomes more important to anthropology as an increased number of societies begin to produce their own sets of mass-mediated messages.[2] Research interests may necessitate the use of content analysis for the study of themes, plots, or the construction of realities in media drama - work that was originally stimulated by Mead and Metraux's The Study of Culture at a Distance (1953). As more societies begin using the technology of mass media, the entire process of visual communication may be studied as a culturally structured stream of expressive and symbolic activity. This emphasis must include behavioral

[2]Ruby, Jay. "The Anthropological Consequences of a Wired Planet," unpublished paper delivered at the Society for Applied Anthropology meetings, Tucson, Arizona, 1973.

[2]Worth, Sol. "Toward an Anthropological Politics of Symbolic Forms," in Reinventing Anthropology, Dell Hymes, ed., Random House, New York, N.Y., pp. 335-366, 1972.

observations of the process, the artifacts per se, and the audiences for specific productions. This perspective may apply to the creation and reception of a photograph, a film, or a television program, as well as to the creation of an art object, or the study of dance and other folkloric performances.

4. A final problem is the dissemination of research findings, that is, in developing the most effective strategy for using film or other visual forms to present anthropological statements. This problem encompasses not only the types of research mentioned above, but potentially all phases of anthropological inquiry. Here, students explore film as a communication system in order to discover whether a set of filmic conventions can be developed which are somehow uniquely suited for the display of anthropological concepts.[3]*

[3]Ruby, Jay. "Is an Ethnographic Film a Filmic Ethnography?" Studies in The Anthropology of Visual Communication, (2) 2: 104-111, 1975.

*Final sections of this article have been deleted. For complete article see reference p. 56.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC GUIDE

A. Journals and Organizations

B. Select Bibliography

C. Access to Films

A. JOURNALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

In recent years several organizations have been formed either by film scholars or by those in the traditional humanistic disciplines who share an interest in film for scholarship and as a teaching tool. Several are described below, along with a select list of journals dealing especially with teaching, and a basic list of film magazines.

Scholarly Journals and Organizations

Cinema Journal. Published quarterly by the Society for Cinema Studies, an association of film critics, scholars, and historians. Respected for its scholarship. Write: Richard Dyer MacCann, ed., 17 West College Street, Iowa City, Iowa 52242.

Film & History. Quarterly journal published by the Historians Film Committee, an independent organization of historians and social scientists, which is affiliated with the American Historical Association. Includes articles, film and book reviews, and descriptions of courses which relate history to film study. Write: The Historians Film Committee, c/o The History Faculty, New Jersey Institute of Technology, Newark, New Jersey 07102.

Literature/Film Quarterly. Journal devoted to the study of the interrelationships between film and literature, the adaptation of literary works into film, and the teaching of film. Includes interviews, articles, and reviews. Write: Literature/Film Quarterly, Salisbury State College, Salisbury, Maryland 21801.

Journal of Popular Film. Produced quarterly under the auspices of the Popular Culture Association, this journal is an outgrowth of their Journal of Popular Culture. Specializes in articles on film theory and criticism, most of which relate film to patterns in society and culture. Also: filmographies, bibliographies, interviews, and book reviews. Write: Journal of Popular Film, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403.

Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communications. Published from Temple University, this new journal specializes in articles which treat the "use and production of anthropological films and photography for research and teaching." For membership in the Society for the Anthropology of Visual Communications (SAVICOM), which includes subscription to the journal, write: American Anthropological Association, 1703 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Journal of the University Film Association. Dedicated to articles on the teaching of film as well as critical and historical analysis. Write: Journal of the University Film Association, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

University Vision. Published by the British Universities Film Council. Includes articles on the use of film in scholarship and teaching in the sciences and the humanities. Write: B.U.F.C., Royalty House, 72 Dean Street, London W1V 5HB.

Journals of Special Interest to Teachers

AITIA. "A magazine for Two Year Philosophy/Humanities and High School Philosophy/Humanities," includes articles and reviews on classroom audiovisual materials. Write: Center for Philosophy, Law, Citizenship, Inc., Thompson Hall, Room 228, S.U.N.Y. at Farmingdale, Farmingdale, New York 11735.

The History Teacher. Quarterly journal which concentrates on "promising new educational programs, curricula, instructional techniques, and methods of evaluating classroom effectiveness," and also maintains a regular section for review of audiovisual materials. Write: The History Teacher, California State University - Long Beach, Long Beach, California 90840.

Media & Methods. Published nine times a year, this magazine offers innovative approaches to classroom teaching, many of which involve film. Feature length and short films for the classroom are regularly reviewed and evaluated. Write: Media & Methods, 401 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108.

Sight Lines. Published by the Educational Film Library Association, this journal reviews and evaluates the latest releases in the field of educational film. This journal is meant especially for librarians, but teachers can profit from the guide to new materials. Write: E.F.L.A., 43 West 61st Street, New York, New York 10023.

Teaching Philosophy. Concentrates on "innovative methods, classroom strategems, and the use of new materials," including audiovisual aids. Write: Teaching Philosophy, Location 47, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221.

Other Important Film Periodicals

American Film	American Film Institute
10 issues/year	John F. Kennedy Center
$15/year	Washington, D.C. 20566

Cineaste Quarterly $4/year	333 Sixth Avenue New York, New York 10014
Film Comment Bimonthly $9/year	Film Society of Lincoln Center 1865 Broadway New York, New York 10023
Films in Review 10 issues/year $10.50/year	210 East 68th Street New York, New York 10021
Film Library Quarterly $10/year	Film Library Information Council Radio City Station, Box 348 New York, New York 10019
Film Quarterly $6/year	University of California Press Berkeley, California 94702
Jump Cut Quarterly $4/six issues	P.O. Box 865 Berkeley, California 94701
Quarterly Review of Film Studies $14/year	Redgrave Publishing Co. 430 Manville Road Pleasantville, New York 10570
Sight and Sound Quarterly $8/year	Eastern News Distributors 111 Eighth Avenue New York, New York 10011
Take One Monthly $6/year	Unicorn Publishing Box 1778, Station B Montreal, Quebec H3B 3L3 Canada

B. SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Because of the vast number of new publications relating to film which have appeared in recent years, this bibliography is necessarily selective. Care has been taken to concentrate on books and articles published in English since 1970, and most reflect a new awareness of the value of film in humanistic scholarship and teaching.

In addition to theoretical expositions on the relationships between film and the various other disciplines, the list also includes several concrete examples of work that humanists have completed in the past decade. Some of these books and articles, for example: treat film as an expression of broader social and cultural history or racial and ethnic stereotyping, analyze how specific works of literature have been adapted to film, seek to better understand film by applying the analytical techniques and models of the philosopher or psychologist, or use film as an anthropological research tool.

Sources which deal primarily with cinema study as a discipline in itself - those that relate to genre, directors, film history, aesthetics, and criticism, etc. - are easy to find by using the bibliographies listed in section V (A).

History and Sociology

Bergman, Andrew. We're in the Money: Depression America and Its Films. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Burns, E. Bradford. "Conceptualizing the Use of Film to Study History: A Bibliofilmography." Film & History, Vol. IV, No. 4 (1974), pp. 1-11.

_____, ed. Latin American Cinema: Film & History. Los Angeles: U.C.L.A. Latin American Center, 1975.

Cripps, Thomas R. "Film: The Historian's Dangerous Friend." Film & History, Vol. V, No. 4 (1975), pp. 6-9.

_____. Slow Fade to Black: The Negro in American Films, 1900-1942. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Film & The Historian. London: British University Film Council, 1969. A combined reprint of University Vision No. 1 (February

1968) and the report on a conference - "Film and the Historian" - held at University College, London, in April 1968.

"Film: New Challenge and New Possibility." (Special Issue), Arts in Society, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer-Fall, 1973).

"Flashback: Films and History." (Special Issue), Cultures, Vol. II, No. 1 (1974).

Furhammar, Leif and Folke Isaksson. Politics and Film. Translated by Kersti French. New York: Praeger, 1971.

Frair, Ralph and Natasha Frair. The Only Good Indian: The Hollywood Gospel. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1972.

Griffin, Patrick. "Film Document and the Historian." Film & History, Vol. II, No. 2 (1972), pp. 1-5.

_____. "Making of Goodbye Billy." Film & History, Vol. II., No. 2 (1972), pp. 6-10.

Haskell, Molly. From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Huaco, George A. The Sociology of Film Art. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Hughes, William. "Proposal for a Course on Films and History." University Vision, Vol. 8 (1972), pp. 9-18.

Hull, David Stewart. Film in the Third Reich: Art and Propaganda in Nazi Germany. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1973.

Isenberg, Michael T. "A Relationship of Constrained Anxiety: Historians and Film." The History Teacher, Vol. VI, No. 4 (1973), pp. 553-568.

_____. "World War One Comedies and American Society: The Concern with Authoritarianism." Film & History, Vol. V, No. 3 (1975), pp. 7-15.

Jackson, Martin A. "Film as a Source Material: Some Preliminary Notes Toward a Methodology." Journal of Interdisciplinary History, Vol. IV, No. 1 (1973), pp. 73-80.

Jarvie, I. C. Movies and Society. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Jowett, Garth. Film: The Democratic Art. Boston: Little Brown, 1976.

Kracauer, Siegfried. From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Leab, Daniel J. From Sambo to Superspade: The Black Experience in Motion Pictures. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

MacBean, James Roy. Film & Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

McCreary, Eugene C. "Film and History: Some Thoughts on their Interrelationship." Societas, Vol. I, pp. 51-66.

Mraz, John. "Lucia: History and Film in Revolutionary Cuba." Film & History, Vol. V, No. 1 (1975), pp. 8-14.

Murphy, William T. "The National Archives and the Historian's Use of Film." The History Teacher, Vol. VI, No. 1 (1972), pp. 119-134.

O'Connor, John E. "Historians and Film: Some Problems and Prospects." The History Teacher, Vol. VI, No. 4 (1973), pp. 543-552.

Raack, R. C. "Clio's Dark Mirror: The Documentary Film in History." The History Teacher, Vol. VI, No. 1 (1972), pp. 109-118.

Richards, Jeffrey. Visions of Yesterday. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Rollins, Peter C. "Film and American Studies: Questions, Activities, Guides." American Quarterly, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1974), pp. 245-65.

_____. "Making of Will Rogers'1920's." Film & History, Vol. VII, No. 1 (1977), pp. 1-5.

Schuursma, Rolf. "Film and History in the Netherlands." Film & History, Vol. II, No. 4 (1972), pp. 10-16.

Sklar, Robert. Movie Made America: A Cultural History of American Movies. New York: Random House, 1975.

Smith, Paul, ed. The Historian and Film. London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Vanderwood, Paul J. "Hollywood and History: Does Film Make the Connection?" Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Council on Latin American Studies, Vol. II, (1973), pp. 53-59.

Vogel, Amos. Film as a Subversive Art. New York: Random House, 1974.

Warshow, Robert. The Immediate Experience. New York: Atheneum, 1970.

White, David Manning and Richard Averson. The Celluloid Weapon: Social Comment in the American Film. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Wood, Michael. America in the Movies. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Language and Literature

Ball, Robert H. Shakespeare on Silent Film. London: Allen & Unwin, 1968.

Barrett, Gerald G. and Thomas L. Erskine, eds. From Fiction to Film: Ambrose Bierce's "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge." Encino, California: Dickenson Press, 1973. This is the first title in a series including among others: Conrad Aiken's "Silent Snow, Secret Snow" and D. H. Lawrence's "The Rocking Horse Winner."

Bluestone, George. Novels Into Film. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1957. Also Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961.

Braudy, Leo. The World in a Frame: What We See in Films. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Eckert, Charles W., ed. Focus on Shakespearean Films. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Esner, A. G. S. Filmed Books and Plays: A List of Books and Plays From Which Films Have Been Made 1928-69. London: Andre Deutsch, 1971.

"Film as Literature and Language." (Special Issue), Journal of Modern Literature, Vol. III, No. 2 (1973).

Geduld, Harry M., ed. Authors on Film. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

"Graham Greene Special Issue." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 4 (1974).

Harrington, John, ed. Film and/as Literature. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1977.

_____. The Rhetoric of Film. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Hurt, James, ed. Focus on Film and Theatre. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Kawin, Bruce F. Telling It Again and Again: Repetition in Literature and Film. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1972.

Magny, Claude-Edmonde. The Age of the American Novel: The Film Aesthetic of Fiction Between the Wars. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1972. (Translated by Eleanor Hochman.)

Marcus, Fred H., ed. Film and Literature: Contrasts in Media. Scranton: Chandler Publishing, 1971.

_____, ed. Short Story/Short Film. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1977.

McConnell, Frank D. The Spoken Seen: Film and the Romantic Imagination. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1975.

Murray, Edward. The Cinematic Imagination. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1974.

Perlmutter, Ruth. "Add Film to Rhetoric." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 4 (1975), pp. 316-326.

Phillips, Gene D. Graham Greene: The Films of His Fiction. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.

Ruhe, E. L. "Film: The Literary Approach." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 1 (1973), pp. 76-83.

Richardson, Robert. Literature and Film. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Scholes, Robert. "Narration and Narrativity in Film," Quarterly Journal of Film Studies, Vol. I, No. 3 (1976), pp. 282-296.

"Shakespeare on Film." (Special Issue), Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. I, No. 4 (1973).

"Shakespeare on Film II." (Special Issue), Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1976).

Spiegel, Alan. Fiction and the Camera Eye: Visual Consciousness in the Film and the Modern Novel. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1976.

Philosophy and Psychology

Berger, Gretchen. "Audio-visual Material: Sense Data." Aitia, Vol. III, No. 2 (1975), pp. 34-37.

_____. "Audio-visual Material: Looking Back on the Future." Aitia, Vol. IV, No. 1 (1976), pp. 11-12; and Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 37-38.

Boyle, Joan. "Audiovisual Page." Aitia, Vol. I:, No. 3 (1974), pp. 36-37.

Cavell, Stanley. The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Gill, Jerry H. "Of Snakeskins and Wineskins: Art and Religion in the Work of Ingmar Bergman." Encounter Creative Theological Scholarship, Vol. 37, No. 2 (1976), pp. 160-170.

_____. Ingmar Bergman and the Search for Meaning. Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1969.

Gorovitz, Samuel. Medical Ethics Film Review Project. College Park, Maryland: Council for Philosophical Studies, 1975. This 48-page pamphlet with reviews of 94 films and video-tapes is available through the Council at Skinner Hall 1131, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Granrose, John. "The Use of Films in Teaching Philosophy." (A paper with lists of available films attached. Publication is forthcoming. Meanwhile write the author at the Department of Philosophy and Religion, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30602, enclosing $1.00 for copying and mailing.)

Greenberg, Harvey R. The Movies on Your Mind: Film Classics on the Couch from Fellini to Frankenstein. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1975.

Hurley, Neil P. Toward a Film Humanism. New York: Del., 1975. (Originally published in 1970 as Theology and Film.)

Münsterberg, Hugo. The Film: A Psychological Study. New York: Dover, 1970. (Originally published in 1916.)

Penna, Anthony and Mathias von Brauchitsch. "The Design and Teaching of Dramatic Films: An Approach to Values Education." Film & History, Vol. VI, No. 3 (1976), pp. 49-55.

Scriven, Michael. "Review of Appearance and Reality." Teaching Philosophy, Vol. I, No. 1 (1975), pp. 99-100.

Smith, Joanmarie. "Free AV Material: Current Films and TV Programs." Aitia, Vol. I, No. 4 (1973), p. 5.

Wolfenstein, Martha and Nathan Leities. Movies: A Psychological Study. New York: Free Press, 1950.

Vesey, Godfrey. "Teaching Philosophy in Britain's Open University." Teaching Philosophy, Vol. I, No. 1 (1975), pp. 21-28; and Vol. I, No. 2 (1975), pp. 125-134.

Anthropology

Brigard, Emile Rahman de. "The History of Ethnographic Film," in Principles of Visual Anthropology, Paul Hockings, ed. Hague: Mouton, 1975, pp. 13-44.

Collier, John, Jr. Visual Anthropology: Photography as a Research Tool. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

deHeusch, Luc. The Cinema and the Social Sciences: A Survey of Ethnographic and Sociological Films. Paris: UNESCO Reports and Papers in the Social Sciences, No. 16, 1962.

Gardner, Robert. "Anthropology and Film." Daedalus, Vol. 86 (1957), pp. 344-350.

Heider, Karl G. Ethnographic Film. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976.

Hymes, Dell. "The Anthropology of Communication," in Human Communication Theory, Frank X. Dance, ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967, pp. 1-39.

MacDougal, David. "Prospects of the Ethnographic Film." Film Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1969), pp. 16-30.

Michaelis, Anthony R. The Research Film in Biology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Medicine. New York: Academic Press, 1955.

Rouch, Jean. "The Camera and Man." Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1974), pp. 37-44.

_____. "The Situation and Tendencies of the Cinema in Africa." Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication, Vol. II, No. 1 (1975), pp. 51-58.

Ruby, Jay. "Anthropology and Film." Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Vol. I, No. 4 (1976), pp. 436-445.

_____. "Is an Ethnographic Film a Filmic Ethnography?" Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication, Vol. II, No. 2 (1975), pp. 104-111.

_____. "In a Pic's Eye: Interpretive Strategies for Deriving Significance and Meaning from Photographs." Afterimage, Vol. III, No. 9 (1976), pp. 5-7.

Smith, Alfred, ed. Communication and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Weakland, John. "Feature Films and Culture Documents," in Principles of Visual Anthropology, Paul Hockings, ed. Hague: Mouton, 1975, pp. 231-252.

Worth, Sol. "Toward an Anthropological Politics of Symbolic Forms," in Reinventing Anthropology, Dell Hymes, ed. New York: Random House, 1972, pp. 335-366.

Teaching With Film

Amelio, Ralph J. Film in the Classroom. Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard, 1971.

_____. The Filmic Moment: Teaching American Genre Film Through Abstracts. Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum, 1975.

Anderegg, Michael A. "Shakespeare on Film in the Classroom." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1976), pp. 165-175.

Arrowsmith, William. "Film as Educator." Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. III, No. 3 (1969), pp. 75-83. Reprinted in Katz, Perspectives on the Study of Film, noted below.

Culkin, John M. and Anthony Schillaci, eds. Films Deliver: Teaching Creatively with Film. New York: Scholastic Book Service, 1970.

Curtis, James C. and J. Joseph Huthmacher. "The American Dream on Film." Film & History, Vol. III, No. 3 (1973), pp. 17-19.

Goldman, Frederick and Linda R. Burnett. Need Johnny Read? Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum, 1971.

Hartley, Dean Wilson. "How Do We Teach It? A Primer for the Basic Literature/Film Course." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 1 (1975), pp. 60-69.

Hirshfield, Claire. "Teaching History to the Disadvantaged College Student: A History Through Film Approach." Film & History, Vol. IV, No. 1 (1974), pp. 4-10.

Hughes, William. "Proposal for a Course on Films and History." University Vision, Vol. VIII (1972), pp. 9-18.

Katz, John Stuart, ed. Perspectives on the Study of Film. Boston: Little Brown, 1971.

Lacey, Richard. Seeing with Feeling: Film in the Classroom. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1972.

LeGacy, Arthur. "Images of the City: Teaching History Through Film at Syracuse University." Film & History, Vol. IV, No. 2 (1974), pp. 14-17.

Mallery, David. The School and the Art of Motion Pictures. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools, 1966.

Manchell, Frank. Film Study: A Resource Guide. Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973.

Maynard, Richard A. The Celluloid Curriculum: How to Use Movies in the Classroom. New York: Hayden, 1971.

O'Connor, John E. "Film Study and the History Classroom." American Historical Association Newsletter, Vol. XV, No. 3 (1977), pp. 7-9.

_____. and Martin A. Jackson. Teaching History With Film. Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 1974.

O'Grady, Gerald. "The Preparation of Teachers of Media." Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. III, No. 3 (1969), pp. 113-133. Reprinted in Katz, Perspectives on the Study of Film, noted above.

Peters, J. L. M. Teaching About Film. New York: International Documents Service (division of Columbia University Press), 1961.

Phillips, Mark. "Teaching American History with the Three Little Pigs." Media & Methods (November 1969), pp. 65ff.

Poteet, G. Howard, ed. The Complete Guide to Film Study. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

Pronay, Nicholas, Betty R. Smith and Tom Hastie. The Use of Film in History Teaching. London: The Historical Association, 1972.

Rice, Susan. "Teaching Apes: A Review of Planet of the Apes." Media & Methods (October 1973), p. 32ff.

Samuels, Stuart. "Film as Social and Intellectual History at the University of Pennsylvania." Film & History, Vol. II, No. 3 (1972), pp. 14-17.

Schneider, Harold W. "Literature and Film: Marking Out Some Boundaries." Literature/Film Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 1 (1975), pp. 30-44.

Sheridan, Marion C., Harold H. Owen, Jr., et al. The Motion Picture and the Teaching of English. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Smith, Ralph A. "Teaching Film as a Significant Art," in John S. Katz, Perspectives on the Study of Film, noted above, pp. 280-89.

Stewart, David C. Film Study in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council for Education, 1966.

The Uses of Film in the Teaching of English. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Curriculum, Series No. 8. Toronto: Ontario Institute, 1971.

Vanderwood, Paul. "History Through Film at San Diego State." Film & History, Vol. IV, No. 3 (1974), pp. 16-18.

Welsh, James. "Bergman and Anderson for Sophomores." Cinema Journal, Vol. XI (Fall 1971), pp. 52-57.

C. ACCESS TO FILMS

The following basic list of bibliographies and finding aids is meant to be a beginning reference tool. Since any new bibliography of cinema materials is out of date within a few months of publication, there has been no attempt made to be exhaustive. Rather than repeating information that is available elsewhere, a guide has been provided to seven detailed bibliographical reference books which have been published within the past five years. Each of these is organized into subject categories such as film history, genre studies, directors, aesthetics and criticism, and any one of them should provide the necessary first step for the humanist new to film study. Likewise, additional guides to films, film evaluations, and film distributors could have been listed, but the ones included are basic and will provide the novice with a solid beginning.

For the most up-to-date listings of books, articles, and reference sources, see the American Film Institute's Factfile series. Current titles include:

#1 Film & Television Periodicals in English
#2 Careers in Film and Television
#3 Student Film Festivals and Awards
#4 Guide to Classroom Use of Film
#5 Women and Film/Television
#6 Children and Film/Television

The A.F.I. describes them as "frequently updated information documents" which "will stress essential reference information of use to teachers, students, researchers, and the general public whose work or interests relate to the motion picture arts." Factfiles are available from the Institute at $3.00 each ($2.00 for A.F.I. members). Send checks to: Factfile, National Education Services, A.F.I., Kennedy Center, Washington D.C. 20566.

Basic Bibliographies About Film

Bowles, Stephen E. An Approach to Film Study: A Selected Booklist. New York: Revisionist Press, 1974. (A small but well-arranged-by-topic bibliography; includes some entries in foreign languages and a list of periodicals, also by topic or type.)

Dyment, Alan R. The Literature of Film. London: White Lion Publishers, 1975. (An annotated bibliography of books about film published between 1930 and 1970. Subject categories include "History," "Aesthetics and Criticism," "Personalities," and "The Film Industry.")

Gottesman, Ronald and Harry M. Geduld. Guidebook to Film: An Eleven-in-One Reference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. (Contains an annotated bibliography of books in all areas of film study as well as lists of significant periodicals, and Ph.D. dissertations that have dealt with film history and criticism.)

Limbacher, James L., ed. A Reference Guide to Audio-Visual Information. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1972. (Annotated bibliography arranged by topic and indexed by subject, covering a wide range of material.)

McCann, Richard D. and Edward S. Perry. The New Film Index. New York: Dutton, 1975. (A comprehensive bibliograpny of articles relating to film which appeared in film journals and periodicals between 1930 and 1970. Intended to continue the work of Harold Leonard's The Film Index, originally published by the Museum of Modern Art in 1941 and reissued by Arno Press in 1966.)

Monaco, James and Susan Schenker. Books About Film: A Bibliographical Checklist. 3rd ed. New York: New York Zoetrope, 1976. (This is a very selective listing, but should be noted for its publication date.)

Rehrauer, George. Cinema Booklist. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1972. Also, Cinema Booklist: Supplement One. Metuchen: The Scarecrow Press, 1974. (Extensive and annotated bibliography of books listed alphabetically by title, with a subject index - cumulative in supplement.)

General Guides and Film Evaluations

American Film Institute Catalog: Feature Films 1921-1930. Two volumes. Kenneth Munden, ed. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1970.

American Film Institute Catalog: Feature Films 1961-1970. Two volumes. Richard Krafsur, ed. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976.
(These volumes offer detailed plot summaries and production information about virtually every American feature film released in the twenties and sixties. The comprehensive subject index is especially useful.)

Educational Film Library Association Evaluation Guide. New York: E.F.L.A., 1965. (This basic guide provides capsule evaluations of educational films. There have been two supplements, and the evaluations are updated monthly for libraries.)

The New York Times Film Reviews, 1913-1968. Six volumes. New York: The New York Times, 1970. (This basic collection and the supplements to it covering 1969-70, 1971-72, and 1973-74, provide no subject index, but the production information and critical judgments of the Times' reviewers are valuable guides in choosing feature films.)

How to Locate Reviews of Plays and Films: A Bibliography of Criticism from the Beginning to the Present. Gordon Samples. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1976. (Concise, well organized by topic and time period, with annotated bibliography. Treats plays and films in separate sections.)

Special Area Guides

Africa from Real to Reel: An African Filmography. Stephen Ohrn and Rebecca Riley, eds. Waltham, Massachusetts: African Studies Association, 1976.

American Folklore Films and Videotapes: An Index. Bill Ferris and Judy Peiser, eds. Memphis, Tennessee: Center for Southern Folklore, 1976.

Bibliography of Non-print Instructional Materials on the American Indian. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Institute of Indian Services and Research, 1972.

The Civil War in Motion Pictures: A Bibliography of Films Produced in the United States Since 1897. Paul Spehr, compiler. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1961. (out of print)

A Filmography of Films About Movies and Movie-Making. (Pamphlet T-26) Rochester, New York: Eastman Kodak Company, 1974.

A Filmography of the Third World: An Annotated List of 16mm. Films. Helen W. Cyr, compiler. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1976.

Films for Anthropological Teaching. Karl G. Heider, compiler. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1972.

Films Kids Like. Susan Rice and Barbara Ludlum, compilers. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Guide to Films about Famous People. Alexandria, Virginia: Serina Press, 1969.

"Hollywood and the American Revolution: A Bicentennial Reappraisal." Lawrence L. Murray. Film & History, Vol. V, No. 3 (1975), pp. 1-6.

Latin American Sights and Sounds: A Guide to Motion Pictures and Music for College Courses. Jane M. Loy, ed. Gainesville, Florida: Consortium of Latin American Studies Programs, 1973.

Multi-Media Materials for Afro-American Studies: A Curriculum Orientation. Henry A. Johnson, ed. Alexandria, Virginia: Serina Press, 1971.

Superfilms: An International Guide to Award-Winning Educational Films. Salvatore J. Parlato. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1976.

The War/Peace Film Guide. Lucy Dougall, ed. Berkeley, California: World Without War Council, 1970.

Women's Films in Print. Bonnie Dawson, compiler. San Francisco: Booklegger Press, 1975.

Guides to Film Distributors

Feature Films

Feature Films on 8mm and 16mm. James Limbacher, ed. Fifth edition. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976.

Film Programmer's Guide to 16 mm Rentals. Kathleen Weaver, ed. Second Edition. Albany, California: Reel Research, 1976.

Educational Films

Index to 16 mm Educational Films. National Information Center for Educational Media. Fifth Edition, 3 volumes. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1975.

Educators' Guide to Free Films. 36th annual edition. Randolph, Wisconsin: Educators' Progress Service, 1976.

Let's See It Again: Free Films for Elementary Schools. J. A. Kislia. Dayton, Ohio: Pflaum, 1975.

North American Film and Video Directory. Olga Weber, compiler. New York: R. R. Bowker, 1976. (No films are listed here, only public libraries and university audiovisual centers by geographic location. Consult those near you.)

Catalogs

Most commercial film distributors provide free catalogs of their collections (non-commercial sources often ask a minimal fee for their catalog.) A reference shelf of such catalogs can be the teacher's most convenient

source of information, and they are absolutely essential to confirm the listings and prices in the above guides which can quickly become out-of-date. For a complete list of distributors and their addresses, see either Feature Films on 8mm and 16mm or Index to 16mm Educational Films.